DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 112 810 HE 006 881

TITLE A Critical Approach to Inter-University Co-operation. Paper No. 13.
INSTITUTION International Association of Universities, Paris (France).
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 138p.; Papers presented at the International Association of Universities (13th, Paris, France, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$6.97 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Educational Objectives; *Foreign Relations; *Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *International Education; *International Programs

ABSTRACT

International university cooperation is the main purpose of the International Association of Universities (IAU). Certain problems arise in the field of international cooperation and particularly in the field of assistance. The helping hand easily becomes a dominating hand while the notion of mutual exchange presupposes the existence and recognition of differences. Consequences of such recognition are reciprocity; an ability to let immediate objectives remain secondary to long-term ones; and the work of the universities. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

International Association of Universities

PAPERS-13

ED112810

A CRITICAL APPROACH TO INTER-UNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 006 881

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
International assoc of universities
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

PARIS 1974

The French edition of this volume is published under the title:

Une approche critique de
la coopération interuniversitaire

The designations employed in this volume do not imply any expression of opinion on the part of the International Association of Universities concerning the legal status of any country, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitations of the frontiers of any country or territory.

The opinions expressed are those of the participants and do not engage the responsibility of the Administrative Board of IAU. They are published in this form for the information of all interested in the subject of the seminar.

ISBN 92 - 9002 - 124 - 1
French Edition : ISBN 92 - 9002 - 224 - 8
© Copyright by the International Association of Universities, 1974

CONTENTS

Pages

FOREWORD 7

INTRODUCTORY NOTE 9

THE PURPOSE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF CO-OPERATION 13

Dr. PREM KIRPAL, President, Institute of Cultural Relations and Development Studies, New Delhi 13

Dr. R. CUEVAS DEL CID, Secretary-General, Central American University Confederation 23

Discussion 32

RECIPROCITY IN CO-OPERATION 39

Dr. Y.K.LULE, Secretary General, Association of African Universities 39

Prof. J.-C. DISCHAMPS, President, University of Nice 43

Discussion 49

FRAMEWORKS FOR CO-OPERATION 55

Dr. AMNUAY TAPINGKAE, Director, Regional Institute of Higher Education and Development, Singapore 55

Dr. KENNETH HOLLAND, Former President, Institute of International Education, New York 60

Discussion 63

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF CO-OPERATION 67

Prof. J. GLIGORIJEVIĆ, Rector, University of Belgrade 67

Mr. STEPHEN H. STACKPOLE, Director, Commonwealth Program, Carnegie Corporation of New York 72

Discussion 77

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 85

General Discussion 85

Secrétariat Aide-mémoire 90

Closing Discussion 97

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS 99

WORKING PROGRAMME 102

ANNEX 103

FOREWORD

The Seminar recorded in this volume, devoted to inter-university co-operation, was the third in a new series inaugurated by IAU at the end of 1971. Each of these seminars, of course, has been a co-operative enterprise. They aim to deepen international discussion of common problems and they try to do this in particular universities where these problems are of special significance at a given time. International discussions often go aground because they are too abstract, too generalized. It is important therefore to link them as closely as possible to real situations.

The third Seminar was focused on co-operation itself and on the new problems which it is now raising and which call for a new approach. There could be no more suitable place for discussions of this kind than the University of Belgrade. It not only practises co-operation on a very wide scale but also takes an active part in the work of the League of Yugoslav Universities and in the organization of the seminar entitled *The University To-day*, held each year in Dubrovnik.

Information about this seminar will be found in the text of the report but it perhaps should be stressed here that the Dubrovnik Seminar constitutes one of the most useful and continuous instruments for direct co-operation and contact between university people which have existed in Europe since the Second World War.

The welcome extended to the IAU Seminar in Belgrade surpassed even what could be expected from such remarkable precedents. There was even a danger that it might encourage a purely enthusiastic rather than a critical approach to co-operation. The critical spirit of the Yugoslav participants managed to overcome this, however, and I am glad to have this opportunity of expressing the Association's gratitude to all of them.

That gratitude must also be extended to the participants and observers who came from many different parts of the world to exchange experience and set out their views. In doing so they have given important service to the world university community and helped IAU to do its work more effectively.

Veli Merikoski,
President
International Association
of Universities.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The Seminar reported upon in these pages took place from 6 to 10 May, 1974.

Decisions concerning its organization were taken by the Administrative Board of IAU in 1973 and 1974. Papers by some of the participants were prepared in advance and earlier studies by IAU made in 1959 and 1968 were also distributed.

Participants were chosen in view of their direct personal experience of conducting programmes of co-operation, and this report, it is hoped, will be of service to all those engaged in similar activities.

The Seminar opened on Monday, 6 May. Professor Stevan Gaber, Rector of the University of Skopje, extended a warm welcome to the participants on behalf of all members of the League of Yugoslav Universities. They were specially pleased to be associated with the Seminar and delighted that the University of Belgrade had been invited by the International Association of Universities to act as its host.

The Secretary-General of IAU, Mr. H.M.R. Keyes, thanked those present for accepting the invitation to take part in the Seminar's work. The President and Administrative Board of the International Association were most grateful to them and to the Rector and other members of the University of Belgrade for their generous help and hospitality.

It was agreed that the Chairmen for the working sessions of the Seminar should be Professor J. Gligorijević, Professor K.A. Rybnikov, M. Maurice Beutler, Mr. R.C. Griffiths, Mgr. G. Leclercq and Sir Hugh Springer, and that the report should be prepared by the IAU Secretariat.

***

The work of the Seminar began with the following remarks by Mr. H.M.R. Keyes:

"International university co-operation is, of course, the main purpose of IAU and the Association has already devoted a number of studies to it. Co-operation is a very broad purpose, however, which can serve as a label for a variety of activities, among which choices have to be made. Not so long ago the criteria for making these choices appeared relatively simple. They mainly had to do with effective ways of using scarce resources. The implication was that international co-operation was intrinsically good in itself—permanently on the side of the angels. It was recognized that it could be rather wasteful at times; badly planned; hampered by

bureaucratic procedures; incompetently or negligently administered; unrealistic in its objectives--but all these shortcomings were redeemed in the eyes of most people by the international character of the effort involved. "Internationalism" was good, and though it is difficult for good to prevail in an imperfect world, no one would have wanted to suggest that international co-operation could ever be the ally of evil. There is perhaps less certainty about this now, and the new questioning led the Board of IAU to put the subject forward again for discussion.

It must be admitted that there are widespread suspicions nowadays that the angels of co-operation may have been infiltrated by a few devils in disguise. Perhaps, to be somewhat philosophical about it, it might be said that there is a deeper relationship between vice and virtue than we usually care to admit. There has been an element of what may be called "charity" in some programmes of co-operation, since they in part took the form of the rich helping the poor. Now charity has long been presented as an unadulterated virtue, but in our age of greater diffidence we have come to realize that charity can indeed be adulterated by hidden forms of assertiveness that seek to take advantage of the rejection, humiliation or misery of others to make them physically and psychologically dependent upon benefactions, and the benefactor. The helping hand easily becomes a dominating hand, even if it did not wish to be this at the outset. Subtle questions of this kind now pose serious problems in the field of international co-operation and particularly in programmes of assistance.

It would be generally agreed among university people that no direct political string should be attached to programmes of educational assistance. But the fact is that there are more ways of wielding influence than by straight political control. A culture cannot easily be separated from its structure and its instruments, among which language is perhaps the most important one—and it has even been doubted whether science itself—not science as a set of more or less related discoveries but science as it is actually taught, produced and practised—can really be abstracted from the sociological conditions in which it emerged and continues to emerge. This means that structures—whether scientific or cultural—cannot be transferred from one setting to another without important consequences. Nowadays this is generally recognized as a truism.

It is also worth mentioning that many nations do in fact actually wish for their cultures to be modified and stimulated by injections from foreign ones—and there is certainly no harm in cross-fertilization. But it is a process which it is difficult to control, and there is always a danger that the receiving culture may be stifled, rather than stimulated. It not only becomes temporarily dependent but loses even its power to reconquer its independence, for it loses the power to think and feel independently, to invent and formulate its own mode of development or to create a society in which its members really feel at home. A world debased by uniformity might be gradually produced by such processes. The well-meaning internationalist might argue that such uniformity would make for easier mutual understanding, but in fact it destroys the very possibility of self-understanding and there can be no mutual understanding without self-understanding. Large masses of people with at least superficially similar attitudes and aspirations are far easier to manipulate politically, economically and commercially. If such a process were pushed to its extreme, an almost wholly predictable "world market" would be created, and the winners in such a process are not difficult to identify.

All this might sound like a warning against international university co-operation, but it is only a warning against some of its dangers. Universities cannot exist without international co-operation and almost every university department or faculty, in any country, depends heavily upon university work done in other universities in the past or at the present time. As is pointed out in a small brochure describing our Association "universities must by their very nature live in a state of international association. Their horizons are as wide as knowledge itself and they must strive to attain some grasp of its immense resources, in all places and in all ages. They live in part by borrowing from each other and the work they do gradually becomes their common property. Together they maintain and enlarge a common intellectual treasure house." If this is true, universities are clearly instruments for mutual understanding between cultures, peoples and nations and they must play this rôle as fully as possible.

The notion of mutual exchange, however, presupposes the existence and recognition of differences and several consequences seem to follow.

Firstly, reciprocity is very important in co-operation and this will be the theme of one of the Seminar sessions.

Secondly, co-operation can be seen both as a means and as an end and this makes it very difficult in certain cases to determine its proper place and scope. To build up a lively, perceptive and generous world-wide university community is an end in itself. It is part of the purpose of all universities, but in a number of situations it can only be pursued cautiously, for the bigger purpose can only be fully achieved if others are achieved beforehand. There is no doubt, for example, that co-operation is made easier by the use of a common language. It could be argued therefore that universities which gradually abandon the use of an international language such as English and switch to their national language can be seen as obstructing international co-operation. This point was made at our second Seminar, at Kuala Lumpur, which discussed, among other themes, that of *The University, Language and National Identity.* It was emphasized, for instance, that a nation cannot take full possession of its mental and spiritual resources except through its own mother tongue. The use of the mother tongue enables it to affirm its own identity and in fact to enrich the international community by bringing an original and unique contribution to it. This is one of the cases where the immediate objectives of co-operation should be secondary to more long-term ones. But there are plenty of others. For instance, the unification of university structures and study programmes can certainly help the exchange of students and teachers, but if it is pushed too far it might in the end deprive such exchanges of any real purpose.

The third consequence is that co-operation, so far as possible, must be the work of universities themselves. They know their own needs better than anyone else, and are perhaps more sensitive to the deeper needs of the community than governments, which are almost always at grips with immediate problems. Saying this, of course, does not mean that governments, and the great international organizations for co-operation, ought to be excluded. In many cases they alone can provide the resources required and they can also provide useful criteria for judging the value of particular programmes. No one would ask that governments should be silent about inter-university co-operation—on the contrary, they should be asked to assist universities and university people in carrying out plans in which the universities themselves remain the promoters and principal

agents. A number of these problems will be discussed in the session devoted to *Frameworks for Co-operation.*

The *Criteria for the Evaluation of Co-operation* evidently depend entirely on the purpose which one attributes to co-operation itself. It seems clear that these criteria must be applied at several levels.

The first is that of the relationship of a programme to its immediate objectives. Has it, for example, succeeded in creating in a new university a successful department of physics? Has it stimulated new teaching methods? Has it encouraged useful research? Has it arranged for a rational utilization of shared equipment?

The second level is that of the adaptation of programmes to the development needs of a country, where these can be adequately defined. This is the level which, quite legitimately, usually interests governments and a number of international organizations. A programme may succeed, for example, in creating a good school of Greek studies in an African university, but the government of the country in question may well have its doubts as to whether this should be a priority objective. This is perhaps an extreme example, but it shows that tensions and even contradictions can arise between these first two levels of evaluation.

The third level is that of long-term effects, and is probably the one which raises the most formidable difficulties. It is a matter of knowing how deeply co-operation affects the life, culture and powers of original creation of a whole society. In this, questions have to be asked, even about the consequences of programmes which can be considered as desirable in terms of the first two levels of criteria. The installation in a country of a university which runs well, which trains the doctors and engineers and all those whom the government and the economy need, but which is essentially built on a foreign model, does this not involve a risk of preventing the country from developing its own educational models its own cultural pattern, its own type of social structure and economic organization? This inhibiting effect is likely to be all the greater if the new university is a resounding success in its first achievements.

All these problems need to be very carefully studied by universities. Their full implications are not easy to assess by those of us who come from countries where universities have been established for a very long time. We may well be in danger of exaggerating the scale of intellectual and economic dependence in Africa or in Latin America, for instance, even when we are anxious not to do this and believe that we are carrying out a helpful task.

Questionings of this kind are now very widespread and by no means limited to the IAU Secretariat—though by virtue of its daily contact with them it is particularly aware of their importance. Our Seminar cannot hope to provide clear and unequivocal answers to all of them, but it may help to clear the ground and dispel some misunderstandings. Our Secretariat's task here is to compile as faithful a record as it can of your discussions. But these will only acquire their full significance when put into the context of many more years of vigilant self-questioning and self-examination by all those concerned with the day-to-day work of co-operation. In the long run, some of these problems may no longer exist, in a world where "assistance" will have been replaced by free and reciprocal "co-operation". What can we do to hasten the arrival of that kind of world?

THE PURPOSE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION

On behalf of Professor J. Gligorijević, who was unable to be present at the first part of the session, Professor Miroslav Popović, Pro-Rector of the University of Belgrade, took the chair and called on Dr. Prem Kirpal and Dr. R. Cuevas del Cid to present their papers.

DR. PREM KIRPAL
President, Institute of Cultural Relations
and Development Studies
New Delhi

I should like to begin my short statement to introduce the large and broad theme of the purposes and significance of inter-university co-operation by quoting briefly from a memorable speech made by one of my illustrious compatriots, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, before the General Assembly of the United Nations at its 16th Session on 10 November 1961. In that speech Prime Minister Nehru made his suggestion about the worldwide observance of International Co-operation Year in the following words :

"The essential thing about this world is co-operation, and even today, between countries which are opposed to each other in the political fields and other fields, there is a vast amount of co-operation. Little is known, or little is said, about this co-operation that is going on, but a great deal is said about every point of conflict, and so the world is full of this idea that the conflicts go on and we live on the verge of disaster. Perhaps it would be a truer picture if the co-operating elements in the world today were put forward and we were made to think that the world depends on co-operation and not on conflict... It has been suggested that perhaps this Assembly might resolve to call upon all the countries of the world to devote a year, not to speeches about peace—I do not think that is much good—but to the furtherance of co-operative activities in any field,—political, cultural, and whatever fields there may be, and there are thousands of fields. That perhaps would direct some of our energy and some of our thinking to this idea of co-operation, which would create an atmosphere for solving the problems more easily... The practical approach to this problem is such that *the choice offered to the world is: co-operate or perish.*"

Nehru made his suggestion in the context of the world's political climate in which tensions and conflicts prevailed and were daily highlighted by the media of mass communications. His concluding words apply equally to the present situation of the university in a world of revolutions

in both education and communication. We can say today: The choice offered to the university is: co-operate or stagnate, and for an institutoni like the university, entrusted with the noble pursuit of truth and human values, stagnation can be worse than perishing.

The Need for Inter-University Co-operation

Since the university aims at the pursuit of truth, the creation, transmission and dissemination of knowledge, the cultivation of human values, and the refinement of the human spirit through fresh creations in the fields of the arts, the humanities and the sciences, it must co-operate with individuals and organizations involved in the same concerns. Inter-university co-operation should be intense and extensive, depending upon the means and modalities available and possible.

In actual practice, however, the university tends to become a closed establishment, wallowing in its own mission which is often the maintenance of a traditional *status quo*, failing to co-operate even with its next-door neighbour. For example, the hundred and odd universities of India need to co-operate with each other, but actually there is neither any strong motivation felt nor even a modest practice of such co-operation. This failure at the national level explains to some extent the slow advances towards international co-operation. In fact, there is often more co-operation at the international level than at the national level. A deeper study of the failure at the national level would be interesting and revealing.

The subject of inter-university co-operation is vast and complex and generalizations are of little value. My remarks will be confined to the purposes and significance of inter-university co-operation between the institutions of the so-called developed, largely western world and the developing countries of the so-called third world.

The university of the developing countries is often derived from western origins and continues to be an imitation of its original protoytpe. Its power to create and innovate is extremely feeble, almost non-existent. It clings tenaciously to the forms of its origin without developing any capacity for changes of substance and quick responses to changing social, intellectual and ethical needs. Unlike most western institutions, it has not been able to adapt itself to new requirements and tends, therefore, to function in academic ivory towers of privileged establishments out of touch with the quick tempo of change and the increasing pulsation of life in the larger society around.

The university in the developed countries still reflects the spirit and flavour of western hegemony and projects the power and concerns of industrialized societies in spite of the avowed universality of its mission. It is conscious of the elitist structures and policies of the newly independent countries whose leadership is derived from its own alumni, remaining isolated from their larger societies in rapid transition. Consequently its new relationships with the universities of the developing countries are conceived in attitudes of assurance and the spirit of superiority, a kind of communication between the parent and his offshoot. The nature and style of co-operation resulting from this limitation introduce an element of unreality into the situation. The existing patterns of co-operation are designed to maintain the traditional set-up while innovation is the urgent need of developing countries, involving a radical transformation of the institutions derived from the traditional past. The key to the

health and strength of inter-university co-operation between the developed and the developing countries lies in its capacity to generate and support innovations that are needed urgently to link the university to the larger societies around it and to improve the relevance and quality of its performance.

The urgent need for innovations is common to all developing countries. I shall elaborate briefly by describing the Indian situation in general terms and then referring to two examples of success and failure in the application of international university co-operation to concrete attempts at reform and innovation. My statement will be concluded by drawing two lessons from past experiences and projecting into the future from the trends and possibilities now emerging.

The General Setting

Innovations in all spheres of national life are needed urgently by old, traditional societies of Asia struggling to catch up with the rapid changes and new vistas suddenly opened to contemporary man in a world now more unified than ever by the inexorable march of science and technology, and the spread of common ideas and universal human values. This situation which is often described as the process of modernization is confronted by all developing countries of Asia. Tradition must adapt itself to the new forces of change or perish: the challenge faced by the Asian countries is nothing short of building upon the roots of their old cultures modern societies in tune with new aspirations and exploiting the immense possibilities generated by the scientific and technological revolutions of our times. To meet this fateful challenge, developing societies, often largely illiterate and extremely poor, require intelligent, resourceful and bold leadership. The urgent need for a new elite gives special importance and urgency to the nature and quality of higher education at the university level and the transformation of institutional structures inherited from the colonial or feudal past. Innovation becomes a matter of survival and the essential condition of progress, The university plays the key rôle because it must train new types of teachers who should be innovators in all spheres of national activity.

The odds against innovation in general continue to be heavy in the developing countries of Asia. Traditional modes and institutions are hard to change and the path of modernization is not easy in the absence of adequate and right type of education and the essential infrastructure of material and moral development. The revolution in communication has disturbed the stability of traditional societies. The explosion of numbers in universities has led to the selective principle of concentrating scarce resources on building up a few centres of excellence rather than distributing resources equally among an ever-increasing number of institutions. The respective claims of elementary education, middle level education, higher education and adult education are seldom estimated correctly in terms of social needs and the requirements of development. The links between these levels and their effective co-ordination is not adequately explored and clearly established. Policy decisions emerge haphazardly out of a welter of circumstances and complexity of pressures, responding more to the exigencies of the moment than to carefully prepared and long-term plans of development.

Policies are, therefore, often based on wishes and slogans, and seldom on objective understanding of facts and motivations. Within the framework of political life and power structures, universities and educational establishments are comparatively weak and educators are seldom given the status and rewards that go to civil service administrators and other bureaucrats and professional groups. The political strength and national authority wielded by education ministers and university rectors are often a decisive factor in bringing about change and innovation, but it is rare for these dignitaries to command such a position.

Higher education is often fragmented and placed under the control of various government departments such as Education, Health, Agriculture, Labour, Commerce, Industries and Defence. In some countries even a bifurcation between science and technology and general education takes place. The co-ordinating machinery is either non-existent or ineffective. This state of affairs mars thorough planning as well as effective economic implementation. Above all it leads to a failure to integrate higher education in national planning, resulting in unemployment of graduates, wasteful duplication of efforts and lack of adequate mobilization of scarce resources.

Paucity of material resources is undoubtedly a great obstacle to innovations that often cost money. Increasing populations, slow growth rates of economic development, and the rising cost of university education have caused a fall in per capita expenditure on higher education while large expansion of numbers goes on at increasing tempo. Little is left for raising the quality of the university after the pressing claims of mass education at all levels are met by political leaders. The growing awareness of the value of higher education in terms of investment in economic and social growth and its central place in the development of human resources will certainly lead to larger financial allocations, but for a long time to come sufficient money will not be available and more reliance will have to be placed on better planning, greater efficiency in implementation and the development of the skills and attitudes required for resourceful management and purposeful change. It is in these directions that international university co-operation can render most valuable service.

The widening gap between planning and implementation is in fact the most crucial problem of reform and innovation and money is not the only factor responsible for the present state of affairs. Educationists in the developing countries of Asia are poignantly aware of the glaring gap between thought and action which has assumed the proportions of an epidemic and is listlessly accepted by all concerned in a continuing mood of despair and fatalism. Reports and recommendations abound and commissions and committees confer perpetually to examine the same problems; the innovative action that emerges from these exercises is remarkably small, and it is even accepted cynically by those in authority that a full and genuine implementation was never intended. The *status quo* persists tenaciously till its irrelevance and unworkability make it meaningless. Better planning, action-oriented research, wise and speedy implementation with constant evaluation in view, the method of decentralization both in planning and in implementation, and a spirit of dedication on the part of those responsible for higher education are sorely needed for giving reality to reform and a fair scope to innovations.

There is much talk about the spirit of dedication, which is frequently referred to in clichés and platitudes that have become the stock in trade of politicians who continue to pronounce on all educational problems

without sufficient understanding of their complexities and implications, and especially of the needs and aspirations of those directly concerned in the process of education—students, teachers and administrators. Lack of sufficient involvement in the nature and process of change on the part of young people, their teachers and parents, administrators, politicians and policy-makers, results in confusion and inertia. It is a most discouraging sign of the times, and little is attempted to develop meaningful communication, mutual participation, and smooth co-ordination that are needed to generate a new sense of purpose and co-operation. Educational authorities and universities continue to be relatively weak elements of national establishments and receive insufficient attention and backing from public opinion and from the makers of overall policies and dispensers of public resources. In this state of neglect, confusion and fear, the universities lose any vitality they may have possessed and cling to their rights and privileges without manifesting any strong will for change and improvement.

The resistance of vested interests to change, and especially the deep conservatism of the university persist tenaciously. There is urgent need for change from within, but the signs of accepting and creating new ideas are not encouraging. The interference of governments in university affairs is matched by the indifference and passivity of universities. The dependence of the university on government increases, the interference of political parties often creates vicious situations, and within the governance of a university there is little scope and few incentives for experimentation and the search for quality. Petty intrigues and power politics are rife in universities and they are far from setting standards and propagating values for the larger society. Hardly any significant attempts have been made to link the university with the community around, and the academic ivory towers often shelter mediocrity and a suffocating emptiness. The fresh breezes of change seldom blow into these places.

While the use of new technologies for opening up universities to the fast accumulating knowledge and its changing relationship to the life and values of contemporary man is now easily within the reach of reformers and innovators, little has been done even to promote the methods and facilities of self-education, and to bring within the fold of a university the larger community in search of lifelong education and thus establish crucial links between formal and non-formal education. The student-teacher relationship needs some drastic changes and a fresh orientation, but these developments are nowhere in evidence. There have been some considerable improvements in the emoluments of university teachers, but their increasing involvement in personal research and public affairs weakens the most precious elements in education, the intimate contact between the teacher and the taught. Yet television can today bring the most dynamic teachers closer to a vast audience, and modern libraries and computers open new possibilities for self-education.

Finally, in India as in other countries of Asia, and in other parts of the world, the new attitudes of youth to society, expressed in apparently different forms and manifestation of discontent, but sharing basically a common outlook of humanity and sincerity, must influence the development of new patterns of higher education and the rôle of the youth in the transformation of society. The so-called Student Revolution of our times calls for a better understanding of contemporary youth and the fascinating problem it presents to society. There is need for closer communication, deeper understanding and imaginative action on the part all of concerned

in the process of higher education. This is one of the major challenges of the coming decade.

The difficulties of innovative action in universities generally I have mentioned are reflected in the various efforts to bring about change. Inter-university co-operation has been used in these efforts and has indeed often provided the motivation and the capacity for innovation. I refer briefly to two examples of success and failure highlighting the difficulties as well as opportunities.

I. — The Establishment of Centres of Advanced Study in Indian Universities

The innovation for building several centres of advanced study at a number of Indian universities in order to strengthen postgraduate studies and research has met with considerable success and illustrates the effectiveness of international co-operation.

The need for developing a few centres of excellence at Indian universities arose from the fact that rapid quantitative expansion was resulting in the multiplication of a large number of mediocre institutions. In order to specialize at the postgraduate level Indian students were compelled to go abroad in increasing numbers for doctoral and post-doctoral work. Political pressures in the democratic set-up both in the States of the Indian Union and under Union Government itself led to a rapid increase of universities and colleges. The socialistic and democratic policies of the State militated against the establishment of private institutions requiring large expenditure on the part of students. At the same time it was recognized that at the higher level of education a process of selection was inevitable and exceptional merit should be nurtured for strengthening the top leadership in different branches of national activity. Originally the idea of setting up a national university possibly in Delhi with international standards of learning was seriously mooted and the Ford Foundation expressed its interest in giving substantial support to such a venture. This idea, however, was soon given up in favour of selecting a number of well developed departments in various universities and upgrading these to centres of advanced study in different subjects. It was felt that this project would result in a wide distribution of centres of excellence in different regions and avoid the possibility of concentrating the best academic resources at a single national university. The scheme was proposed and elaborated by the University Grants Commission with the help of top experts in various fields of research and study. It was commended by the Planning Commission and approved by the Government.

An important feature of developing the centres of advanced study was to develop closer association of these selected departments with the best centres outside India. For this purpose the assistance of Unesco was sought and some help from the United Kingdom through the British Council was secured. There are now more than 30 centres of advanced study operating in natural sciences, technology, social sciences and humanities. The external assistance makes it possible for outstanding scientists and scholars to visit the Indian centres from time to time and to work with the Indian staff. It also enables Indian scholars and professors to spend periods of study abroad. With Unesco's assistance a large number of academicians from the U.S.S.R. have visited the Indian centres. British and American professors have also participated in this scheme.

The innovation outlined above has been a conspicuous success and it is expected that the 30-odd centres of advanced study will soon be increased substantially and in this way standards of post-graduate studies and research raised. The success of this innovation at the level of higher education in India has also made some impact upon the educational policies of other Asian and African countries which adopted the same strategy for raising university standards.

II. — The Introduction of the Semester System at the University of Delhi

One of the most deplorable features of Indian education has been the system of examinations as inherited from the past. Examinations encouraged cramming and made educational programmes uninteresting and unrealistic. A single public examination at the end of two or three years' course would determine the fate of a student. The system resulted in the comparative neglect of studies by students for a major part of the university course, depending upon the spurt of two or three months' cramming immediately before the public examination. The nature of question papers set and the methods of imparting instruction through lecture notes made the educational process something of a farce. In such a system independent thinking was not encouraged and originality of initiative and experimentation was at a discount.

After independence the Ministry of Education made several efforts to reform the system of examinations and through it the programme of studies at the universities. The example of the United States was found to be of great value and several American specialists visited the universities and educational planning centres for this purpose. Eventually it was decided to introduce the semester system on the lines of the American universities in the four Central Universities under the control of the Union Government. These Central Universities are located at Delhi, Benares, Aligarh, and Shantiniketan. Specialists from American universities and Indian professors visiting American universities co-operated in evolving the reform.

The semester system was introduced recently at the University of Delhi. Unfortunately, the experiment ended in a fiasco as student agitators intervened and disrupted the holding of the semester examinations.

The semester system was intended to reduce the burden of a single public examination by distributing the courses over a period of four or six semesters. As such it should have been welcomed by the students. On the other hand, the students thought that the authorities were imposing four or six examinations on them instead of the one examination held previously. The failure of the reform was due to the fact that while a new system was introduced, its implications were not fully worked out: for example, conditions for regular and sustained work on the part of the students were not developed at the universities and the old habit of cramming just before the examinations continued to prevail. The books required for weekly assessment and regular semester work were not available in the libraries and the large number of students in the affiliated colleges and university departments could not receive adequate advice and supervision from university lecturers. The fate of this innovation which survived in a very limited form brings out the need for developing all aspects of a new activity and making sure that the essential infrastructure of reform is built up carefully. It also shows the imperative need for better communication

between policymakers who decide upon reforms and the students for whose benefit such innovations are introduced. The element of international co-operation involved in the attempted reform also went wrong and well-meaning specialists from outside did not grasp the wholeness of the situation.

Such examples of success and failure can be multiplied. Numerous exchanges of professors and students take place in many ways. Visits of educationists, teachers and scholars are arranged under the Government of India's cultural agreements with foreign countries, notably the agreements with the U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia, France and Federal Germany.

Similar exchanges take place with the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth countries. There is a large variety of co-operative programmes with the American universities. Contacts with Japanese universities are just beginning. The UNDP projects and the Unesco programmes also generate some inter-university co-operation. Successes and failures of the type reflected in the two examples given above occur in most of the co-operative ventures. Apart from the centres of advanced study at universities, foreign collaboration involving university people occurs in several areas, such as medical education and research, home science, agricultural universities, institutes of technology, national science laboratories, rural higher education, educational planning and research, and specialized institutions in the fields of management, designs, mass media, languages, etc.

From the Indian experience of international university co-operation in its varied forms, three lessons of some importance can be drawn:

1. From the standpoint of universities and other institutions of research and higher education the aspect of *technical assistance* for development is the predominant feature of international university co-operation. The building up of centres of advanced study succeeded by utilizing the technical assistance aspect. Specialists, training facilities and equipment from outside were coveted and received. The United Nations' style of giving assistance dominated the process of co-operation which itself remained subsidiary to the rather formal and delicate relationship between the donor and the recipients. The United Nations' way of technical assistance has certainly brought new resources to the developing countries to satisfy their own felt needs, but it has not generated international co-operation in the true sense. Technical assistance added to the existing systems and strengthened weak and languishing efforts; but real co-operation among university people was needed for innovations and new undertakings. Co-operation for change and innovation did not take place; the action for technical assistance was welcomed but its volume was meagre compared to the magnitude of the needs.

2. The style and mechanism of technical assistance have dominated the scene, resulting in the increasing government control in co-ordinating diverse efforts and controlling the activities of external agencies. The universities have been the passive actors, responding to the calls of co-ordinating bodies set up by governments, rendering or receiving aid, but rarely getting involved in an overall university-to-university co-operation between institutions of the affluent and the economically backward countries. For the developing countries in urgent need of innovation and transformation, the style and strategies of technical assistance, to the extent that they existed in any form, were inadequate and disappointing, and

their human impact was negligible. The universities of the developed countries did not gain in reputation either; the use of university resources by their establishments of political power and industrial wealth made them suspects among the radical elements of their own societies and the nationalists at the receiving end.

In the developing countries government control of influence from outside becomes narrow and vigilant, restricting the free flow of scholars and ideas even in societies which had been remarkably open. True co-operation is the real victim, and the universality and independence of the university suffer in the process of an increasing obsession with strait jacket technical assistance methods and operations.

3. The result of this state of affairs is the unfortunate *loss of initiative* by the university in developing co-operation with its counterparts in other cultures and societies. University-to-university dialogue is different and inter-university co-operative programmes between the developed and the developing countries are even more rare. The Leviathan swallows all in the name of national interest and national security. Signs of protest or nonconformity from university people are conspicuously absent: this contributes to the decline of the university in society, the extension of nationalistic and bureaucratic barriers to the free flow of ideas, and the strengthening of bilateral action at the expense of multilateral programmes under the auspices of Unesco and IAU.

The present situation of international university co-operation is far from healthy and promising. The power gap between the developed and the developing countries gives rise to fears, suspicions and defence mechanisms which encourage isolation. For instance the Indian open society of the last decade tends to shrink within itself with threats, actual or imagined, of gross misuse of foreign money for corrupting the intelligentsia, the gathering of intelligence for the requirements of power politics and the suspicious penetration of research and scholarship into the sensitive areas in which national integrity is weak and vulnerable. The gap between affluence and poverty inhibits co-operation and only a common quest for quality of life and human values can overcome the gap manifested in comfort and consumption. The urgency and complexity of internal problems in the developing countries lead to the neglect of the university and education gets low priority in attention as well as resources. Problems of communication, complicated by linguistic difficulties, cause further obstacles. In the context of these forces inhibiting co-operation, the university remains traditional, static and inward-looking.

Fortunately, however, there are also new and emerging forces favouring inter-university co-operation. From the three explosions of knowledge, of numbers and of expectations the university is under pressure everywhere, and complacency and inaction are no longer possible. New challenges as well as opportunities arise from the twin tasks of the building of lasting peace and human solidarity, and the pursuit of development for quality of life. The need for new leadership and more relevant values gains urgency. The communications revolution and the new technologies of education open out possibilities that cannot be ignored. Global problems of science and technology and new tasks for the management of the planet confront all mankind. Pollution, environment, ecology, oceanography, hydrology, population control, space exploration, food, health, energy resources, education and youth problems are no longer mere words and slogans.

The claims of cultural diversity have to be reconciled with the actualities of technological uniformity. For us the challenge is no less than the blending of science and spirituality into a new humanism that takes care of social order and social justice as well as the needs and aspirations of the inner man. In the midst of all this pulsation of life and multiplicity of problems the university cannot stand still. It must respond adequately or wither away into insignificance. Co-operation becomes the condition of survival, and also the way to reform and renewal.

In spite of our staggering problems of poverty and shortages, and the relentless battle for decent living standards for rápidly growing populations, we in India, and I believe elsewhere in Asia and the third-world countries, still pin our hope and retain our faith in the rôle and mission of the university to create new knowledge and human values and to contribute significantly to the process of development for quality of life. Undoubtedly the same faith prevails elsewhere, and out of this universal respect for the communities of scholars that seek truth and decency, a greater and larger chapter of international university co-operation could emerge rapidly. To bring together the universities of the affluent and the economically handicapped countries in effective and imaginative enterprises many things need to be done. Co-operative activities need to be focused on certain clear and important objectives, such as the launching of wisely planned innovations, qualitative improvement of academic programmes and university management, better planning and reform of education, both formal and non-formal, meaningful co-ordination and dissemination of research and greater reciprocity of exchanges, highlighting the rôle of university youth. A specially promising sign of the times is the recent movement towards an international university network reflected in the concept of the United Nations University. The strong support given by the developing countries to the proposal for establishing the United Nations University network is significant. It underlines their faith in gaining equality and developing their own centres of excellence through the method of inter-university co-operation. One hopes that Unesco and IAU will play the leading rôle in this development. Some centre for collecting data about co-operative programmes and disseminating it regularly and systematically is clearly an urgent need, which could be appropriately filled by IAU. Unesco and IAU could also promote the development of clusters of universities around the world to co-operate for specific tasks and activities, related to developments. Such clusters, operated with a measure of flexibility and spontaneity, would further the objectives of the United Nations University without running the risk of setting up rigid and formal institutional structures and methods of action.

Finally I should like to come back to where I started this statement and the reference to the launching of International Co-operation Year. Such events are merely symbolic, and tend to become a ritualistic habit of the United Nations Assemblies and Conferences. However, it might be a good idea to observe in the near future a World Universities Year, highlighting the achievements and potentialities of co-operation among the universities of all regions and cultures, initiating new and important activities, and dedicating a minute fraction of funds used for peace-keeping and material development to the noble cause of developing inter-university co-operation. If the one world of tomorrow is to become a reality and the gap between affluence and poverty is to be narrowed by raising both material standards and the quality of life, the university, as the most

universal of national institutions, must make notable contributions to this transformation.

Dr. RAFAEL CUEVAS DEL CID *

Secretary-General, Central American University Confederation

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The Latin American Context

The ideas and considerations which make up this paper relate to Latin America and, more specifically, to universities in Central America, for it is impossible to examine this topic in a world setting. Each university has its own social context and, being part of the superstructure of society, it largely reflects national structures. In much the same way, the *purposes* of international co-operation should correspond to the realities of particular university situations. Co-operation between countries which have reached a high level of social and economic development cannot be the same as co-operation between countries which are still partly dependent, and, consequently, retarded in their development. Nevertheless, it is quite possible to refer in general terms to Latin American universities, and certainly to Central American universities ; these are linked by the similarities of their situation, they share common purposes, and have at their disposal bodies for co-operation with clearly defined organizational structures, functions and purposes.

A New University for Latin America

A very brief historical note seems necessary here. The Latin American university was born during the Spanish colonial period. In its development it thus followed the Spanish model but later adopted the characteristics of the Napoleonic university. The political emancipation which occurred at the beginning of the nineteenth century did little to change this and the Latin American university continued to find its inspiration in the European model. However, after the second decade of the twentieth century the influence of North America began to make itself felt. A product of the dependent state of Latin American countries, this influence continues to increase. The consequences are obvious: it encourages the training of a kind of professional manpower which does not correspond to the needs of the society in which the university is set; the organization of teaching, research and administration continues to draw closer to the North American model; "development" programmes are usually heavily backed by foreign funds (and almost always associated with heavy obligations which distort the national reality of the university), etc, etc. These, in a word, are problems of *dependence*.

It may be recalled that the particular characteristics of the Latin American university were acquired mainly as a consequence of movements for reform and transformation, which first began to emerge sharply at the University of Córdoba, Argentina, in 1918. Since then the Latin American university has had its own particular stamp. It is not necessary to refer to all its characteristics here, but mention should be made of the most important: a) the *autonomy* of the university, expressed in the power to set up its own governing and administrative bodies, to use its resources

* *Paper translated from the Spanish and abridged.*

as it wishes, and to define the guiding principles which it judges necessary for university teaching, research and extension activities. It should be noted, however, that this legal autonomy is not as a rule accompanied, as it should be, by financial autonomy. b) significant *student participation* in the decision-making bodies of the university. First there was the struggle, now won, to obtain the student "third"; later, came the struggle for "parity" (numerically equal representation of academic staff and students in university decision-making bodies). But a growing wave of "interventions" by dictatorial regimes has recently challenged the rights and achievements of the students.

The Latin American university, like all other universities, is constantly *called into question*. All authority, all knowledge, all forms of organization of teaching and research, etc... are examined to appraise their effectiveness, relevance, and legitimacy. This, as Darcy Ribeiro has said, has led to a *total rethinking* of the nature of the university. And it is obvious that no attempt can be made to examine the purposes and the significance of international university co-operation without first clarifying the purposes and significance of the *university* itself.

An analysis of the present university situation in Latin America and an examination of the thinking and attitudes of its members (academic staff, administrators and students) reveal a strong desire to discover a *new kind of university*. At present, however, they only have clear ideas about what *they do not want* in their university, but this is normal in the initial phase of any major transformation. What they wish it to become in the future remains unknown.

This is why the following statements are still uncertain (almost hypotheses); their sole purpose is to reveal the main characteristics of the rupture, and, in doing so, indicate the general direction in which the Latin American university of tomorrow should develop.

In the first place, Latin American countries (and hence the greater part of the university community) have become aware of their situation of *total dependence*. This is evident in all fields; in particular in the economic one (exploitation of natural and human resources by powerful countries, proliferation of "multinational" firms; inequality of terms of trade; proliferation of excessively expensive foreign technology; total dependence on international markets—also dominated by the powerful nations, etc., etc.). Confronted by this, there has grown a feeling of *total rejection* of the situation of dependence, and a *desire* (still largely lacking tangible form) to *achieve real independence*.

As a result of this dependence and of the structures maintaining it in the different countries, the peoples of Latin America exhibit all the characteristics of significant backwardness: malnutrition, illiteracy, diseases of every kind, enormous social and economic inequalities. It is only to be expected, therefore, that Latin American universities seek the best means of remedying the situation. Of necessity, these means will be linked to liberation from dependence, to replacement of the old structures and to the search for new ways in which the university can act within the community, etc.

The existence of dictatorial regimes can be considered as a by-product of such situations of dependence and of the backwardness which results from them. In their presence university autonomy plays an important rôle. It provides a refuge for freedom of expression, a relatively impartial setting for the serious examination of national problems, and a favourable

climate for the discussion of ideas and the development of rigorous and profound thought. From this, it follows quite obviously that, almost without exception members of the Latin American university community consider autonomy to be a valuable *instrument* serving the transformation and independence of the countries no less than the particular purposes of the university.

Such situations—and many others almost all resulting from neo-colonialism—encourage the main sectors of the Latin American university to seek new fields of action which will make possible the fulfilment of national aspirations.

Let us examine some of them:

A New Significance for University Functions

New Functions for the University

New functions must be added to the traditional tasks of teaching, research and "extension". The most important is doubtless what may be described as the *social* function of the university. Consequently, the university can no longer confine its activity to the mere transmission of knowledge nor even to the search for new knowledge and its diffusion. The fund of knowledge represented by the university must also serve as an instrument of social change. Teaching must no longer take the form of the magistral lecture, perpetuating a mechanical transfer of knowledge. It must be enriched with material drawn from the reality of national life. New forms of teaching will appear; among them and most important, in my opinion, those which see *the whole country as a field for professional training.* Technical training plays a secondary rôle. Basic multidisciplinary education, in direct contact with the realities of national life, will be sufficient to produce a new kind of graduate with a thorough knowledge of his country's problems. This may also help to check the "brain-drain": graduates trained in the particular setting of their own countries would no longer present a temptation to consumer societies, which demand a highly sophisticated kind of technology.

With regard to *research*, particular emphasis should be put on social research, although this should not imply the total abandon of pure research. Latin American scholars must acquire a thorough knowledge of the peoples of their countries.

Similar considerations apply equally to what is known as university "extension". Culture will no longer simply be communicated to the masses, but will be created in contact with them. Phenomena such as illiteracy could disappear rapidly, if a conscious and concerted effort were to be made by the universities and the people.

Consequences

The concomitant of such new functions must be the emergence of a new kind of *Latin American university.* Within this broad perspective, the following purposes could be assigned to the university:

a) the fostering of a sense of responsibility in the minds of all members of the university (academic staff, administrators, students); b) the training of *a kind of graduate* suited to the conditions in which he will be required to serve, and who will at the same time be a real agent of change; c) the more rational and above all, more just use of the university's financial

resources; d) the creation of genuine teachers and real research workers; e) the creation of a highly effective and flexible form of university *administration*, dynamic and imaginative and hence the antithesis of a bureaucracy; f) such a university whose domain extends as far as the frontiers of its country or region cannot long elude *political* commitment and the *critical* and *self-critical* awareness which constitutes its vital *link with the people*, or escape its obligation to put an end to *dependence*, to *backwardness* and to the maintenance of an injust *status quo*.

Purposes and Significance of the New Latin American University

In the light of the above considerations (which, as already pointed out, are intended to interpret the aspirations of the Latin American university community), the university in these countries would have as its purposes: a) to do its best to help its country (or region) bring to an end the present state of dependence; b) correspondingly, its mission may be defined as helping to enable *man to live as man*, enjoying the means necessary for a dignified existence and for self-fulfilment; c) to this end the university must regard itself as an *integral part of the people* to whom it belongs. This new relationship will make possible a multidisciplinary and integrated form of education, the training of political awareness for change and the modification of the mental attitudes of the university community; d) the traditional *functions* of the university and its new functions must acquire a *completely new significance*; e) consequently the university must assume in full its political rôle, its social commitment and its critical and self-critical rôle.

The significance and importance of this new university trend in Latin America are clear.

PURPOSES AND SIGNIFICANCE OF INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION

Purposes

Against the background of the numerous references made above to the Latin American university situation, it may now be stated that the purposes ascribed to the new Latin American university *should also be those which inspire inter-university co-operation.*

These may be summarized as serving the country (or region) as well as possible, in order to *bring to an end* the present state of *dependence.*

Conceived in this way, the purposes of international university co-operation will have numerous consequences for the very nature of the university and its activities.

The Nature of the University:

In this field, international university co-operation should above all be concerned with the following:

a) University Autonomy or Co-ordination with the State

It has already been stressed that university autonomy remains a fundamental value in almost all Latin American countries. Here, a distinction should be made between *real* autonomy and purely *formal* autonomy.

At the level of international co-operation, studies should be made to reach a clear definition of the concepts of real and purely formal autonomy, of the necessary variants of autonomy appropriate to each country and region, and of the responsibilities entailed in the exercise of autonomy.

Also in need of definition are the necessary co-ordination between the activities of the autonomous university and those of the nation, and the extent to which university participation in national planning is desirable. In fact, the Union of Universities of Latin America and the Central American University Confederation both regard the defense of the autonomy of their member universities as one of their most important functions. This principle has been effectively applied by the CSUCA (exclusion of universities where there was outside interference, presence of its governing Council and other measures, whenever autonomy or university authorities seemed to be in danger; defence of the human rights of members of the university community, and, in general, of Central Americans, etc...).

The action taken by the CSUCA in this area can serve as a model for international university co-operation.

Some of the political events which have taken place recently in Latin America demand a new appraisal of the question of autonomy. The assumption of power by governments committed to a positive transformation of the realities of Latin American countries has led, in some cases, to a limitation of autonomy, in order to co-ordinate university participation in the task undertaken by the State to achieve change. These new situations must also be studied in the framework of international co-operation, in order to define the limits of real autonomy, which, without compromising the processes of change, will allow the university community to define its own rôle.

Legal autonomy, in any case, is not enough. *University centres* must enjoy financial autonomy. There are numerous methods of ensuring this and these should also be studied by international organizations concerned with interuniversity co-operation.

b) Responsibility of the University: its Commitment to Society; its Political and Social Consciousness.

The commitment of the university to society of which it forms part should find practical expression. International university co-operation should therefore study the various methods of action the university community can use to support and encourage popular aspirations: practical relationships with workers and peasants, education of all social classes, etc...

Social consciousness can result from the establishment of new kinds of relationship between the university and the people. For members of the university community it is the concomitant of a sound understanding of the reality of each country, of its relationships of production, of its problems, etc...

In order to achieve these purposes, international university co-operation should pay particular attention to developing studies in the social sciences and to examining the ways of putting them into practice. The Central American University Confederation has a Central American social sciences programme (research, teaching, seminars, periodicals, etc...) and is joint sponsor, with the University of Costa Rica, of the Central American School of Sociology.

c) University Organization.

The training of a new kind of graduate, who is not only a technician, but an educated man, calls for a total revision of the old organizational patterns. The existence of faculties should be questioned, and faculty "privileges" must disappear once and for all, as should all structures

leading to the compartmentalization of knowledge. The new graduates, trained in close contact with social reality, equipped with multidisciplinary or transdisciplinary knowledge—can only be produced in a university which offers a wide range of possible combinations and which trains men capable of serving the free society of the future.

In this field, there are many opportunities for international university co-operation. These include not only the creation of regional centres, but also the exchange of information, of students and of academic staff. All this within the Latin American region, in order to avoid producing ill-adapted graduates and to ensure that they remain capable of responding to the social reality in which they live, and of transforming it.

In Central America, there are a number of centres serving the whole region and, in some cases, Central American students are even able to carry out their practical or field work in their own countries under supervision. The Faculty of Veterinary Medicine and Animal Husbandry in Guatemala, for example, allows students from other countries in the region to do this.

Teaching:

A new kind of university demands, without any doubt, a new kind of teacher and a new kind of student. As far as the teacher is concerned, the important thing is to modify his training, and, in doing so, his attitudes.

This is another fruitful area for Latin American university co-operation. There is a need to train a new kind of university teacher, socially conscious, freed from the influence of false hierarchies, skilled in social science research techniques and conversant with field study techniques and methods of teamwork, etc... There is undoubtedly an urgent need to bring together the most enlightened minds from the countries of the region to discuss ways of training this new kind of university teacher.

Parallel to the study of new teaching methods, thought should be given to new methods of evaluation of studies. And even the validity of evaluation itself should be questioned.

In this parenthesis, reference should be made to *post-graduate* studies. They, like everything else, should be called into question. To what extent are they really necessary in Latin America? In the opinion of the author, post-graduate studies remain necessary, but they should be regarded not as constituting "superspecialization" but as falling within the same perspective of commitment to society which should be given to all university people. They may also constitute the driving force for university teachers to re-train themselves. Here again, such postgraduate training should take place in the graduate's own country or in one enjoying similar conditions and not in universities in countries with a much higher level of social and economic development which are only likely to "deform" him.

In order to fulfil its purposes, international university co-operation ought to study new methods of organizing postgraduate studies.

Research:

A new concept of the university must certainly provide an important place for research. It is time that the Latin American university community asked itself *what kind of research* and *what kind of research workers* it really requires. Apart from pure scientific research which is costly and rarely of practical relevance—it is not infrequent to find generous

financial support, usually from foreign sources, for research projects which are of no use to the country in which they are carried out.

A new concept of the mission of university research calls first of all for research to be undertaken in fields chosen freely by the country concerned or by its universities, as integral parts of their programmes and not selected on the basis of the availability of foreign financial support.

It is difficult to speak in general terms of the fields of research likely to be of interest to all Latin American countries. Examples can be given, however, of several kinds of research of obvious utility: a) *social* research, based on the increasingly accurate techniques being made available by the social sciences. This type of research is needed most urgently in economically backward countries, moreover, it does not cost as much as traditional "scientific" research and does not require specialized training in centralized institutions generating cultural dependence; b) research into the *nature* in our countries is another field generally almost completely neglected. Sound research in the field of natural resources (renewable or non-renewable) could constitute a solid basis for governments to formulate policies to protect valuable natural resources from irrational exploitation and from the voracious appetites of international business concerns.

This is an area in which university co-operation must not simply follow up the recommendations already made; it must also seek to promote research in the fields which are really relevant to the basic task of freeing Latin American countries from dependence.

In matters of finance, as in other fields, the basic policies of CSUCA set standards which may serve as an example:

"The Confederation will accept financial support only for *programmes which it has itself established*, or *for which the initiative came from its own organs*. In the case of co-operation with bodies outside the Confederation, such bodies may not intervene in making decisions about the programme; nor may they impose restrictions of any kind (Article 37); "In no case will the co-operation of outside bodies be allowed to infringe on *national sovereignty or dignity*, or *university autonomy*" (article quoted above); "When outside financing is necessary it may not cover more than half of the total cost of the programme" (article quoted above).

University "Extension":

Some preliminary remarks are necessary: a) the word "extension" is used less and less because it leads to confusion and because of the implicit contradiction vis-à-vis the new concept of the university.

If the limits of a university's activities already reach to the frontiers of its country it evidently cannot perform an "extension" function; on the contrary, any cultural activity it carries out for the people or the masses will be an *integral part of its own function*. The term "extension" should therefore be replaced by "service", "cultural activity" or some other expression; b) in some universities, moreover, the designation "extension" has been wrongly applied to "supervised practical or field work" or to "social service" which students undertake in rural areas during their final years of study.

Despite terminological difficulties, there is no doubt that the activities now designated in many universities as "university extension" or "cultural diffusion" should be continued and expanded. In both the Central American and Latin American regions, the task of "university extension" and of "cultural diffusion" have been matters for international university

study. The First Central American Meeting on University Extension was held in Guatemala in 1971; and special mention must be made of the Second Latin American Conference on Cultural Diffusion and Extension, Mexico, February 1972, at which a number of important studies were presented. Reference should be made in this connection to the work of Angel Rama and of Darcy Ribeiro (protagonist of the "modernist" tendency in the university in opposition to the "revolutionary").

Administration:

Whatever the type of university, one of the tasks of the administration is to provide *supporting services* for the other functions of the university. However, despite this relatively secondary rôle, it is quite evident that the successful exercise of the principal functions of a university depends to a considerable extent on the effectiveness of the administration. In recent years, therefore, the universities of Latin America have been seeking to improve their administration.

This trend should certainly be followed in setting up a new kind of university, subject to the condition that the administration should be as light, as flexible and as efficient as possible. It should in addition possess the lively imagination needed to resolve the thorny problems raised by a university no longer enclosed within the confines of its own walls.

In response to these new demands, international university co-operation can play a rôle of capital importance, in particular by bringing together the experience gained by individual universities in setting up new programmes in this field. Frequent meetings of heads of different administrative services, the establishment of regional information centres, the creation of mechanisms to facilitate transfers from one university to another, etc... will without doubt contribute to the establishment and improvement of administrative systems.

Various initiatives have been taken in this field in Central America. One of the most important has been the establishment of the Office of Registration and Statistics for Central American Universities. This Office will permit a solution of the thorny problems which arise in matters of "equivalences", of "recognition of qualifications", and of continuation of studies in other universities, etc.

Social Function:

If the university is conceived in a different perspective, it is obvious that *all* its functions will take on a new sense and new dimensions. Teaching, research, extension and administration must be conceived in terms of the principal function of the university.

In addition, numerous functions may be defined within the framework of the *true social function* of the university. Within it are grouped the other functions of the university. The following examples may be given: a) the study of national problems; as a rule these are taken up only sporadically by universities—usually in the form of "political" problems and more rarely as true national problems. Although some universities are legally required to study national problems (and in some cases this is written into their constitutions) the fact remains that they do not do so as systematically or as rigorously as the gravity of the problems demands. The author, when Rector of the University of San Carlos of Guatemala, proposed the establishment of an *Institute for the Study of National Problems.*

The purpose was first to *identify* the major problems of the country on the basis of intensive social research, then to *classify* them in order of priority. Multidisciplinary teams and units of the University would later make a rigorous and systematic study of the problems with the object of proposing to the government and its organs valid solutions to them. It is intended to establish a similar programme for the Central American Region as one of the new activities of CSUCA. b) if universities take seriously their task of tackling national problems they will be able to demand that they should be present when systems of *national planning* are drawn up. In such circumstances their presence would be fully justified and of considerable value. c) in carrying out their social function (and particularly through the ongoing study of problems and the proposal of solutions to them) universities can help to provide the peoples of the region with a *healthy political awareness.* d) through this social function of the university a sense of belonging to a people can be regained and its true cultural and historical identity can be rediscovered. These are only a few examples.

In the field of international university co-operation this is yet another area in which the Central American University Confederation can provide examples which merit attention. Under the Social Science Programme a number of problems concerning the social structure of Central America have been studied, including questions of land tenure, for example. In April 1974 the Secretary-General proposes to hold a meeting of members of the university community, workers and peasants from Honduras and El Salvador to study—from a non-governmental standpoint—the causes and consequences of the armed conflict between the two countries and to examine the possible consequences of peace. A similar discussion has been started as a result of the establishment of a *Latin American Study Group* comprising scholars in different disciplines from a number of Latin American countries. These and many other achievements are the results of Central American university co-operation. Similar initiatives could undoubtedly be taken at all levels and especially at the international level to promote the serious and disinterested study of the problems besetting the world in the latter part of the twentieth century.

Conclusions:

If the highest function of the university in Latin America is to be defined as "seeking to the utmost to help its country (or region) to overcome the present state of *dependency*"—of all kinds and their consequences (backwardness, exploitation, etc.)—then this purpose should at the same time be at the forefront of international university co-operation, at least in so far as concerns the universities of Central America and of Latin America in general. To some extent these objectives will also be shared by other countries which are still colonies or which continue to be dependent (neocolonial). Reference has been made to various ways in which such objectives can be reflected in the traditional functions of the university as well as in new functions, particularly what has been described as the *social function*, and finally an outline has been given of different ways in which international university co-operation can adopt new methods of co-ordination and new ways of sharing experience.

Although this may, at first sight, appear to be a costly process, it is likely to be far simpler than that of university organization at present, and will ultimately permit a much more rational deployment of university

resources which are always scarce in the face of the growing demand for higher education.

Significance

While reiterating what has been said with regard to the new Latin American university, it should be added that if international university co-operation is embodied in a new concept of the university it will acquire a new significance, that of making a positive contribution to the improvement of life and the upholding of human dignity; to the search for new and more just forms of society and with this the true establishment of peace based on justice.

Discussion

Professor Gaber took the chair and opened the discussion.

Dr. GOMA said that, quite clearly, co-operation could not be regarded as a panacea sufficient in itself to remedy the two handicaps which so often afflicted universities in the third world: intellectual dependence and institutional stagnation. One way of helping to overcome them would be to establish a centre of excellence in each university in the hope that this would gradually revitalize and reconstitute the entire fabric of the institution. Rather than spreading its efforts thinly over a wide area, the international community might try to concentrate on helping these centres of excellence to consolidate themselves and develop their activities. Of course, it would first be necessary to identify potential centres and international meetings such as the Belgrade Seminar could be of help in the task of exploration and discovery. Publications could also be of assistance and IAU might wish to re-examine its publications programme to see whether it might serve as a platform for individuals engaged in innovatory experiments to make their work more widely known.

Professor DISCHAMPS agreed with the speakers who had pointed out that the university was an integral part of society and could not be dissociated from it. This was a relatively recent discovery, but nevertheless a fundamental one. The age of the ivory tower had gone its way and it followed from this that university activity in general, and co-operation in particular, should be conceived in terms of society as a whole and of overall historical circumstances. If this were not done, co-operation might well fail to achieve its purpose and lead instead to still greater dependence. As the Secretary-General had implied, co-operation must be approached with a measure of healthy scepticism, if it were not to lose its essential characteristics.

Yet it was no less important to remember that the university had its own values and responsibilities for teaching and research, and that it could not relinquish these without betraying its mission and ultimately destroying the very basis of its social action. If, in its desire to be "modern", the university severed links with its traditions and ceased, for example, to be a repository of culture and intellectual independence, if it put itself entirely at the mercy of the fleeting present, it would deprive itself of the means of fulfilling its mission. It would, therefore, be a mistake for the developing countries to think that they could reject outright the university traditions of the older countries.

Dr. SAITO, speaking of the links between the university and society, recalled that university autonomy had been one of the topics discussed by the IAU General Conference in Tokyo in 1965. The problem still existed, since universities, in Japan at least, were tending to seek shelter behind the defences of autonomy in order to isolate themselves from society. A new balance had to be found.

Professor GABER, while agreeing that the university was clearly an integral part of society, said that society should not necessarily be identified with the ruling regime of the moment; it embodied its own internal contradictions which were reflected on an international level. This was the cause of a complex situtation which must be taken into account; co-operation could not afford to ignore the political climate, and a wide-ranging spirit of tolerance was essential. The motivations which led to co-operation also had a profound influence on its content. In short, co-operation posed in a specific form the general problem of the relations between the university and politics, the elements of which varied considerably from one situation to another. Some regimes which sought to base their conduct on scientific criteria might, for example, react vigorously if a university questioned the validity of their basic principles. In Yugoslavia, universities and students were generally of the opinion that the university should retain its critical function.

Dr. RIBBING felt that, in discussing such complicated questions, it was essential to employ a systematic approach.

To start with, agreement should be possible on certain principles, particularly those concerning peoples' right to independence, human solidarity and the profound unity of mankind. It should also be possible to combine these and use them as a basis for defining major purposes which could be divided into subpurposes. The rôle which the university might play with regard to each one could then be examined and the problems which might be encountered could be identified. The analysis of these problems and of their complex variables could lead to the definition of the action to be taken and of the elements composing this actions. It might be more difficult for those concerned to reach agreement at this level, but agreement at all levels was not absolutely essential. What really mattered was that the areas of agreement and disagreement should be revealed clearly by a rigorous analysis of the problems.

Mr. GRIFFITHS felt that one matter called for clarification. The impression was sometimes given that any form of governmental aid or assistance was suspect. Yet such aid could be beneficial, appropriate to the circumstances and free from political pressure. This must be clearly stated.

If government funds were available, they should be welcomed, accepted without hesitation, and every effort made to use them as effectively as possible. Certain precautions should, of course, be taken.

It was desirable that government funds should be made available in the form of regular block grants, not tied to any particular programme, and that they should be administered by a body separate from the government in question. The rôle of such a body should be limited to the establishment of contact between the co-operating universities and to providing full or partial financial support for the programmes they agreed to set up.

Preferably, the process should begin with the "assisted" university formulating its needs. Following this, a university should be found which could help to meet them. In any case, the main dialogue should take place between the universities concerned, and not between governments. It was up to the universities to ensure that the action agreed upon was acceptable to their governments. Finally, it was important to ensure that academic staff sent on missions of aid and assistance should find their experience interesting and profitable. This was one form of reciprocity.

Sir Hugh SPRINGER spoke of the importance of multinational co-operation between universities grouped into associations such as ACU. Political pressures could be more easily avoided in a multinational setting than under bilateral aid programmes. Through the scholarships it administered, its information service and its appointments service for university staff, ACU was able to stimulate the exchange of persons, of ideas and of experience. The need for these would continue even when aid and assistance were no longer called for. Culture lived by exchange and to borrow from foreign cultures was no cause for shame. Indeed, history showed that peoples transformed the cultures they borrowed from and often created something quite different in doing so.

Dr. GOMA stressed the importance of mutual respect not only between co-operating universities, but also between universities and governments. If governments mistrusted universities, or if universities placed themselves outside the national community, co-operation itself might become suspect and its very basis undermined.

Dr. HOLLAND attached special importance to the free circulation of individuals between different countries and different universities. This was perhaps the best way of ensuring the movement of ideas and a living dialogue between cultures. The support of foreign students through scholarship programmes had quite clearly become indispensable. But it was also desirable for students to be able to travel freely, at their own expense. In order to avoid disappointments and wastage, however, everything should be done to provide them with accurate information about study abroad and to guide them in their choice of programme once they reached their destination. Students should be encouraged to return to their own countries on completing their studies, and it was advisable for their governments to remain in contact with them during their stay abroad to ensure that they did not burn all their bridges.

Dr. RIBBING felt that the question of the purpose of co-operation was of essential relevance to the work of the Seminar as a whole. It should therefore be examined as systematically as possible. The major purposes of co-operation should be defined and then broken down into sub-purposes. Numerous fields were open to co-operation. So far, the Seminar had concentrated on co-operation which sought to transfer knowledge (aid or assistance), and to deepen mutual comprehension by the movement of people and of ideas. A closer analysis was now needed of the implications of each of these purposes.

Mr. KEYES said that co-operation was a matter of continuing concern for IAU and he recalled that, at earlier meetings, the study of aims and

purposes had received special attention. At this point in the discussions, it would perhaps be well to stress the importance of tolerance in the definition and pursuit of the purposes of all forms of international co-operation. No one should be obliged to renounce his convictions in the name of co-operation, and indeed co-operation became impossible, and, for that matter, meaningless, if one of the partners claimed a monopoly of the truth. Unanimity of opinion was by no means necessary for the effective pursuit of purposes jointly defined and accepted. The Dubrovnik Seminar, which was organized annually by the League of Yugoslav Universities, might be quoted as an example of this. There, an air of tolerance provided a favourable climate for exchanges between men and women coming from the most varied intellectual horizons.

Professor DISCHAMPS said that tolerance and openness of mind were all the more necessary since the international community was composed of a wide variety of societies, some of which formed regional groups. At the present time, they shared more questions than common convictions. As Dr. Cuevas del Cid had pointed out, universities knew less about what they really wanted than about what they did not want. Sometimes, all they knew was that they were not what they wanted to be. Despite the diversity of contexts, all concerned should give thought to what a university ought to be. It must be recognized that the university always had its own special mission and could not seek to do everything, since this would lead to failure to do anything of value. If it carried the pursuit of diversity too far, it would run the risk of becoming amorphous. Its main concerns were with teaching and research, but it was never easy to define the exact limits of these two tasks. The university should not lessen the rigour of its training to the point of transforming itself into a sort of kindergarten for adults, nor should it reserve its teaching for small elitist groups engaged in abstract speculation. Without abandoning fundamental research, it must address itself to practical issues and, through a critical approach and the discovery of new knowledge, help the community to overcome the handicaps of ignorance, sickness and scarcity. It should not provide an excessively general education, teaching almost nothing about practically everything, nor should it indulge in the kind of over-specialization which taught practically everything about almost nothing. In short, it must clarify its position and, from its conception of itself, deduce a set of aims. These in turn would have a direct bearing on the purposes of co-operation.

Dr. CUEVAS DEL CID remarked that the university's tasks must be conceived realistically in terms of its social context. The overriding need of some societies was to free themselves from a state of dependence, and for them co-operation was justified only in so far as it helped them in this. In certain situations, co-operation actually led to an increase of dependence and to universities' becoming parasites of foreign institutions instead of being, as they should, a driving force of social transformation. These remarks were in no way intended to imply that the speaker had a pathological aversion to co-operation. It could be most valuable, providing it respected the aims of the university concerned.

Dr. KIRPAL noted that some aims of co-operation had been handed down over the ages without losing their validity. One was the exchange

of knowledge; another, the common development and experience of a culture. Throughout history, and in many different parts of the world, the need to live together and share in attempts to give fuller meaning to certain values had led groups to come together in communities, and between these, relationships had been developed, some more fruitful than others. University co-operation had largely evolved from this tradition, which should be maintained. Now there was a tendency for it to be overshadowed by a new form of co-operation—development aid. This had given rise to problems and had been the source of some serious errors. Since it involved largescale operations, the financial participation of governments was necessary and this brought with it the risk of political exploitation. Development aid, moreover, was often confined to the transfer of techniques, and if these bore no relation to the stage of development reached by the receiving country, they would be completely ineffective. Its structures and methods must therefore be revised. But attention should also be directed to facilitating the traditional forms of free circulation of university people. Currency problems often hindered this, but it might be possible to set up an international fund to help overcome them.

Mgr. Leclercq observed that in attempting to define the aims of co-operation, it was important not to overlook the fact that to a considerable extent it constituted its own purpose. Co-operation had an intrinsic value and was an essential feature of university life and work. Indeed, it was through language and exchange that science and thought developed. Charity had come under attack and yet if true charity signified openness of mind and willingness to receive, it should instead be defended. True co-operation did not involve the imposition of the methods of one partner, but a dialogue, for it was by definition reciprocal. This was not always easy. Difficulties were bound to be encountered and progress could only be made by trial and error. Perfectionism, if carried too far, could lead to co-operation being unproductive. The desire of people for independence was certainly legitimate but it would not be satisfied simply by others recognizing this. Those who wanted independence must themselves know how to secure it and be able to resist becoming engrossed in matters which might alienate them from it.

Dr. Ribbing said that some of the purposes of co-operation, such as the promotion of peace, democracy, economic and social progress, and health, were derived from the outside, from society as a whole. Others were concerned with matters such as the development of knowledge and culture, and the internal efficiency of the system of education, which was more specific to the university. But these were all very general, and they should be broken down into secondary purposes, each having its own methods and structures. The discussion had concentrated on co-operation in education, but distinctions should be made between sectors and disciplines. There was also co-operation in research, the forecasting of needs, planning, and so on.

Dr. Goma recalled that these matters were analysed quite thoroughly in IAU Paper no. 9.

Professor Dischamps said that it was, of course, quite possible to enumerate and classify the aims of co-operation. But the Seminar had

also been asked to consider its significance, and this was something much more elusive. Was there a significance common to all forms of co-operation, one which transcended the aims and purposes of particular undertakings? The remarks made by Mgr. Leclercq opened the way for a definition of this significance as a function of the essence of co-operation. The problem was a difficult one, but this should not allowed to discourage further discussion of it in the Seminar.

Dr. CUEVAS DEL CID doubted whether it was possible to say that co-operation had an inherent significance. Above all, it constituted a means, and to evaluate it, it was necessary first to know why a particular form of co-operation was being carried out and by whom.

Dr. RIBBING asked whether the word "sens" in the French title of the theme implied "direction", or "meaning", as suggested by the English wording, "significance". If the latter, how was it to be distinguished from the *purpose* of co-operation?

Mgr. LECLERCQ said that, to his mind, it was not simply a matter of "direction". Co-operation derived its sense from within itself. Admittedly, it was also a tool at the service of certain purposes. But the common pursuit of such purposes also served to deepen mutual understanding, and in this sense, the purposes themselves were transformed into the means, or vehicles, of co-operation.

Professor DISCHAMPS felt it particularly important to give thought to the significance of co-operation, since the meaning attributed to it had a direct influence on the way in which it was put into practice. The abuses which had been denounced stemmed from a wrong conception of co-operation. But if it was thought of as exchange, mutual giving, and a common search in a world of uncertainties, any form of imperialism which might try to hide under the protection of its name would be condemned in advance.

Sir Hugh SPRINGER wondered whether the most important thing was not the will to work together in mutual respect.

Dr. GOMA agreed and said that, given this will, the most useful course might be to direct the discussion to purposes and methods.

Professor Gaber, Chairman of the session, said that, to keep to the timetable, he was obliged to close the discussion on this point. However, he felt sure that the Seminar would take up these issues again later.

RECIPROCITY IN CO-OPERATION

Professor Rybnikov took the chair and stressed the importance of reciprocity in co-operation. This was a complex notion and should not be thought of in the narrow framework of a rigorously symmetrical exchange in which the two partners did the same things at the same time. The papers to be presented by Dr. Lule and Professor Dischamps and the ensuing discussion would undoubtedly help to throw light on this important question.

DR. Y.K. LULE

Secretary General, Association of African Universities

The Preamble to the Constitution of the Association of African Universities states in part:

> "We, the Heads of Universities and University Institutions in Africa, mindful of the problems and challenges facing the Institutions of Higher Education throughout the African Continent; aware that many of the problems encountered can be solved by developing a system under which there is effective co-operation and consultation among the institutions concerned; conscious of the rôle of the African Universities to maintain adherence and loyalty to world academic standards and to evolve over the years a pattern of higher education in the service of Africa and its peoples and yet promoting a bond of kinship to the larger human society; have resolved to establish a corporate body to achieve our aims and objectives..."

Thus the African universities set out to establish an Association whose main purpose was to encourage and facilitate co-operation among themselves. It was hoped that by developing a system of effective co-operation between them, they would be better able to cope with the many problems they encounter in carrying out their tasks. These problems include inadequate staffing and equipment, shortage or lack of expertise and experience in handling research into the many complex problems of development. They hoped that through a system of co-operation, their lean resources in manpower, equipment and teaching facilities could go much further than would be the case if they operated in isolation. Co-operation was thus to bring certain tangible benefits to the countries and universities involved. These objectives may be achieved in a variety of ways. A university in one country may offer teaching facilities in medicine to students from another country whose university may in turn reciprocate by offering training facilities in engineering or pharmacy.

This is the basic idea of the Inter-African Scholarship Programme. Most countries have some facilities to offer in return for the use of facilities in fields of study which they do not have although it is recognized that some countries and universities participating in this programme may not be in a position to reciprocate equally for every assistance they receive.

Another form of co-operation is when a university may not be able to cover adequately the teaching of a particular branch of a subject. In such cases, the university may be able to arrange for the teaching to be covered by a professor from another university which has developed this speciality. The university receiving such assistance may be able to reciprocate by offering assistance in the teaching of another branch of the same subject or in a different field altogether. Temporary shortages of staff due to illness or other causes may also be met in this way. Another type of co-operation is when a professor from one university going to teach in another university, is replaced by a colleague from that university. This kind of exchange may not necessarily meet specific shortages or needs in the co-operating departments but serves as a means of enabling the two departments to observe each other's approach to research and teaching, to note any novel experiments going on and generally share each other's experiences.

External Examiners

The exchange of external examiners between universities brings similar benefits to the co-operating departments. During his stay in the department he is examining, the external examiner has the opportunity of meeting and discussing with his colleagues the curriculum and content of the subject concerned, including any research projects which may be going on.

The system of using external examiners is basically British but has been adopted by many other universities with British origin. It is designed to help regulate and maintain standards of teaching and research. Traditionally the movement of external examiners has been from the United Kingdom universities to the universities in the developing countries. I have not yet heard of cases of external examiners moving in the other direction.

However, increasingly these days, universities in developing countries appoint external examiners from each other and the movement is in both directions thus bringing mutual benefits to the co-operating institutions.

Exchange of Students for Language Training

Reciprocal arrangements for language training are being worked out between individual African universities. The Universities of Zambia and Zaïre for example have agreed to send to each other roughly equal groups of students to study and practise English and French as the case may be. The sending universities meet the cost of transportation while the receiving university meets the cost of maintaining the students.

The University of Cape Coast in Ghana is currently negotiating a similar scheme with universities in the neighbouring Francophone universities. These arrangements can achieve a lot at minimal cost.

Exchange of Staff between developed and developing countries

On the whole, reciprocity in the exchange of staff between developed and developing countries is rare. The movement of staff has been in

one direction and as has been observed, based on the noble idea of assisting the young universities in the developing countries. Even where there have been movements of staff in both directions, it is difficult to regard these arrangements as reciprocal. Under the American Fulbright-Hays Academic Exchange Programme, for example, the American participants may take up teaching appointments in a selected African university; the African professors they replace then go to the United States for a period of exposure to American academic life, but more as doctoral students rather than as replacements for their American colleagues.

There have, however, been successful cases of reciprocity in staff exchanges between these groups. I am aware of the exchange arrangements between the History Departments of an American University, Duke University; and an African University, Makerere. The American university offers African History as an option in its teaching curriculum and the African university has American History as an option in its teaching programme. The exchange arrangements involve specialists in these two areas and both institutions seem to have derived benefits from these arrangements. There are a number of other areas where similar arrangements could be worked out.

Obstacles - General Problems
Financial Problems

All schemes of co-operation involving the movement of staff, students and material cost money and this is one of the limiting factors. This is a general problem affecting all schemes of exchanges whether reciprocal or not. Money is needed to pay for transportation and in many cases maintenance. Some universities make provision in their estimates to cover the cost of transportation of staff involved in exchange programmes but many have to depend on the generosity of external donors. Exchange schemes covered by cultural agreements between governments often include financial provision to cover transport costs, but we are aware of cases where some developing countries have not been able to afford their part of these agreements. A few exchange schemes are properly funded. The scheme of staff exchanges between the East African universities is now funded annually through the budget of the East African Community; and the student exchanges are covered by agreements between the East African Governments.

The Inter-African Scholarship Programme is at the moment financed mostly from external sources but it is not easy to predict how long this assistance will last. African governments are already interested in the Programme but many of them face financial difficulties and are not yet able to make direct significant financial contributions to the Programme.

Accommodation

Staff exchanges whereby two staff members replace each other and exchange accommodation are known but rare. Even where the period of exchange is as long as a year, it may not be possible for one of the professors to move with his family and in many developing countries suitable accommodation at the right price is just not available. To meet this problem a number of universities in Africa have been provided with funds by foundations and their governments to put up special accommodation for visiting staff and those on exchange programmes. This provision

is unfortunately not common to all universities, neither is it adequate where it exists.

The accommodation of foreign students on exchange programmes presents acute problems particularly in non-residential universities and can be an obstacle to these schemes.

Language Obstacles

Language presents a real obstacle to a free movement of both staff and students and most of the exchanges take place between universities in the same language grouping. Most developing countries have adopted as a medium of instruction the language of the former metropolitan powers and there has been very little attempt to teach other major languages with the result that student exchanges are almost confined to their language group. One of the objectives of the Association of African Universities is to break this language barrier and make it possible for a free movement of students among all member universities. At the last General Conference of the Association held last year at Ibadan, the Association accepted the policy of including a second major language in the curriculum of all undergraduate courses. This objective will of course take many years to achieve. In the meantime, the Association is negotiating with a number of universities, for the setting up of special language centres for the intensive instruction in French and English.

Inadequate Information

Fruitful exchange arrangements between any two institutions must be based on full knowledge of what the two institutions can offer each other in terms of staff, research facilities and programmes. Sufficient information about these matters and on which universities can base decisions is not easily available to all universities. It was to meet such a need that the Association of African Universities set up a documentation centre to collect information about each member university and disseminate it to all the others. It is hoped that this information together with the opportunities for establishing contact during seminars and conferences, will make it easier for member universities to get to know about each other.

Special Problems

Reciprocal student exchanges between universities in the developing world and those in the developed world are rare. The bulk of the movement of students has always been in the direction of the developed countries. Even where there are special exchange schemes such as the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan, the movement seems to be in favour of the developed countries. This is due to two factors. Firstly, the scheme is based on the number of scholarships the host country can afford to offer and the developed countries offer far more scholarships than the developing countries. Secondly, the universities in the developed countries have more prestige and in fact have far more to offer in terms of the variety of courses, research, equipment and staff.

At the undergraduate level, a number of American universities offer a selected number of students an opportunity to spend a year of their undergraduate study in some African universities and offer exchange arrangements with a number of African students from those universities. These arrangements have not worked well, for a number of reasons. The American student who spends a year abroad receives credit for that year.

However, the structure of the degree courses and the system of assessment used in many of our universities are different and make it difficult for the universities to credit their students for the year spent at an American university. This has discouraged many students from taking up these opportunities but the few who have participated in these schemes have benefited greatly. The second difficulty is of course finance. The finance involved in these exchanges is raised in the United States and usually caters for more American students than the number participating from the developing country. The result is to increase the pressure on the limited facilities in the university in the developing country.

Exchange of Scientific Publications

The arrangements whereby university institutions exchange scientific publications and bulletins are of immense value in establishing easy and inexpensive lines of communication between research workers in different parts of the world. These arrangements are usually on a reciprocal basis. The university must have some publication to offer in exchange for those to be received from other universities or research institutes. The problem of the young universities in developing countries is that they do not possess the capacity to produce as many publications as the larger, wealthier and more established universities in the developed countries. Some of the larger universities may put them on their mailing list but others do not find it possible to do so and the younger universities are therefore obliged to subscribe to these publications if they wish to receive them. This is not always easy especially in view of the shortage of foreign currency in the developing countries.

PROFESSOR J.C. DISCHAMPS

President, University of Nice

I should like first to look to the past and try to place the problem of "Reciprocity in Co-operation" in its wider historical perspective.

Strictly speaking, the expression "reciprocal co-operation" is a pleonasm since it is evident that there can be no co-operation without reciprocity. By definition, co-operation is a joint undertaking involving reciprocal investments and returns; etymologically, it is automatically reciprocal.

Yesterday, we exchanged views on a philosophical question: should the word "sens" in the French title of the theme be understood as implying the "direction" or the "meaning" of co-operation? But in both cases I believe that co-operation is still reciprocal. One condition for the development of exchanges is the existence of cultural, scientific or technical differences between the partners, and in the absence of reciprocity there can be no exchanges of lasting value.

The mercantile economists of the seventeenth century employed a very narrow and restricted definition of exchange and considered that one party gained precisely what the other lost. This interpretation is no longer valid, and in the twentieth century we know very well that a partner in an exchange can gain from it only if the other partner does so too.

I must apologize for introducing this question of values. It constitutes a problem in economics, as well as in politics, which is difficult to define and to master and, even if it is asserted that all values are ultimately

labour values, the usage value and the corresponding exchange value that it implies are complementary. Exchange is a key to values and if labour constitutes the basis of all values—then one form of labour is involved in the task of accepting the discipline of exchange.

The history of cultural, scientific and technical co-operation has been marked by a series of waves, flowing first from and then back to particular focal points, sometimes in one part of the world, sometimes in another. Much of present-day tourism is, in fact, a form of return to past sources characterized by migrations and to centres of cultural and scientific life which were alternately poles of attraction and diffusion. Networks of inter-penetration and intercommunication spread across the world from these centres, most of which were also important financially and commercially. Some names are still well remembered and, belonging to the cultural heritage of all humanity, they mark the history of the development of communication and exchange. Pilgrimages, to Mecca or to Santiago de Compostela may have given way to pilgrimages to Moscow or to Princeton, but behind them all is one and the same driving force, the conviction that only in its plurality can humanity move forward. And we too can reach a common understanding, although we represent different organizations. For this, we must accept that the truth is something that everyone may hold, or may at some time have held, but that no one may possess more than a part of it. And we must also recognize that we are all part of a chain: a chain in which all the links are interconnected and which, though it may appear paradoxical, is an expression of our freedom. This same chain expresses the historical continuity and solidarity of mankind and of systems and structures. We all know, as Paul Valéry said, that "civilisations are mortal." But without death there is no life and the fact that a particular approach may only be fragmentary or marginal should in no way disturb us. In the dialectical interpretation of history, and even in the interpretation of historical materialism, social evolution, no less than cultural, technical and scientific evolution, is governed by continuous movement which will cease only with life itself. If we agree on these premises, I believe that we can state at the outset that reciprocity is an essential component of co-operation—part of the very essence of the concept of co-operation.

Cultures have always inter-penetrated and this is evident in many fields—that of language, for example. Specialists in linguistics make scholarly studies of the birth, life and death of languages, and even of particular words. We each believe that we speak a national language, but this is only partially true. Every national language also embodies elements of a supra-national language and these are growing steadily at the expense of the national language.

What is true of languages is true also of animal and vegetable life. Men interpenetrate, if I dare use an expression which may seem shocking, even in an age dominated by the erotic. This interpenetration takes the form of cross-breeding and generally gives impressive results, as we know from the world around us.

And what is true of languages and of the species of life is also true in matters of the arts, manners, values, fashion, taste, production, architecture, philosophy, religion, education, style and consumption. In all these fields, there is evidence of a "universalization" of thought and innovation, and hence of an increasing world-wide interdependence which makes antagonisms between systems and actions and even between leaders, quite marginal.

Indeed, to paraphrase the poet, history shows that the conqueror is generally defeated by his own conquests. This is the theme of a book recently published in France. Entitled "Eloge de la défaite" (In Praise of Defeat), it is based on an apparent paradox: those who at one time appear to be completely dominated, and even crushed by defeat, generally succeed in exerting so great an influence on their conquerors that they ultimately absorb them and convince them of the merits of their own "conquered" civilisation. This is why the developed nations, or those which believe themselves to be developed, have so much to gain from delving into the popular traditions of the nations which are apparently the least developed. There, they may find new opportunities for cultural enrichment and perhaps the strength to still the panic which grips them in the face of an apparently uncontrollable crisis of civilisation. This too is an aspect of reciprocal exchange between peoples.

There is certainly much in the wisdom of the less developed nations that could be of profit to the more developed, and the interplay of individual and collective influences of this kind constitutes an important element in human progress. Techniques, like cultures, have interpenetrated whenever men have come into contact with one another. A few moments ago, I referred to historical materialism. The Marxist dialectic is based on the evolution of the means and techniques of production, in that the development of the superstructure of appropriation is but an expression of the dynamic of the infrastructure of techniques. The Marxists tell us that there is a law of evolution according to which objective factors control the transformation of social relations. This is undoubtedly true, but to it we must add the enrichment of spiritual, sociological and traditional elements, and it is because of these that a modern nation cannot really be a nation if it does not sink its roots deep into the past. The most progressive of the modern nations are in fact very much attached to the past, as those of us who have been to Russia, China or the United States have been able to see for ourselves. Technology and culture thus appear as complementary elements. They cannot be separated and until recently, the rate of technical change was sufficiently slow for the amalgam of culture and technology to remain stable, thus avoiding the creation of rifts between different peoples, cultures and technologies. The interpenetrations stimulated by the travellers of Antiquity and the Middle Ages helped to spread ideas already found elsewhere—gunpowder and printing are but two examples—and in this they were like the wind carrying pollen to fertilize new flowers. But today we are confronted with the consequences of an explosively rapid development of knowledge and of scientific innovation. This has created problems of a completely new dimension because the scientific and technological revolution no longer permits a harmonious evolutionary process. The disruption has been so great that we have come to talk of "advanced" and "retarded" peoples, yet in the past peoples were separated merely by differences of size and not by level of technology. When a technological advance was made, it was of limited significance and did not endanger the cultural balance, but today, technological advances can endanger a whole species. It must therefore be recognized universally that reciprocity in cultural, scientific and technical co-operation is a factor of order as well as of equity. *Homo faber* evolved from *homo sapiens* and *homo oeconomicus* from *homo faber*, but the latter are doomed to failure if *homo sapiens* does not remain present in them. In the midst of all our exaggerations and economic,

technical and scientific excesses, reciprocity can help us to remain conscious of the primacy of culture and of the fundamental values which define man as subject and thus save him from being dominated by the objects he has himself created.

Faced with the risk of becoming subordinate to the object, and of man becoming a robot severed from his cultural roots, our best defence lies in a return to sources in nations which are apparently among the least developed, but which are perhaps still the closest to the fundamental nature of *homo sapiens*. Money and goods threaten to stifle the human spirit. It is still alive today in the nations least touched by industrial technology, and the more privileged of our universities are able to enjoy the enriching experience of rediscovering in them the roots, which are threatened, if not already severed, by the concepts we now worship, often without realizing that we do so: concepts of rationalization, organization, urbanization, concentration, profit, saving, capital, investment, and lastly, the concept of growth which is perhaps at one and the same time the worst and the best of all. I am an economist and a whole-hearted supporter of balanced, harmonious growth. But like most of my colleagues, I am aware of the limits of growth, though I do not share the exaggerated predictions of the Club of Rome. I believe that reciprocity in co-operation can help us reach a more realistic assessment of the possibilities of growth.

Our universities are primarily instruments for teaching, training and research, but they are also self-questioning instruments. They are asking why, for whom, and how they should engage in research, teaching and training. Here again, reciprocity in co-operation may be able to help, perhaps not by answering these questions, but by enabling us to understand them a little more clearly. Personally, I reject any monistic or exclusive interpretation. I believe that only a collective interpretation derived from a synthesis, albeit provisional, of different theses and antitheses and coming from developed and less developed universities, can enable us to ensure that our university institutions develop in ways which will serve the whole of mankind. This, undoubtedly, is the highest goal we can set for ourselves.

In the advanced countries the three major questions I have raised are usually formulated badly and sometimes they are not even posed. They are the countries in which we find a series of entirely new features, planning by objectives, for example, which raises the problem of the definition and choice of objectives. Planning itself has become relatively easy, thanks to the techniques perfected by countries with centralized economies and by large multinational companies in the decetralized countries. I will not go so far as to suggest that there is a trend towards a common planning process, but certain common techniques have been evolved, even if the purposes for which they are used are fundamentally different, or appear to be so.

New features are also evident in relations with the social environment. Yesterday, Dr. Kirpal spoke of the passing of the ivory tower of the university, and Dr. Cuevas del Cid confronted us with the question of our relationship with society as a whole. Universities form part of society, both in developed and in less developed countries, but their relationship to society remains to be redefined, at least in the developed countries.

New features are apparent in the disciplines. Interdisciplinarity itself raises problems, as does the delimitation of the different fields of knowledge. Our efforts to abolish the frontiers separating faculties and

departments are meeting with only limited success, because the conservatism of the scholar is a social and psychological reality of university life throughout the world. However progressive we may claim to be, we all tend to be victims of a deep-seated and stifling conservatism.

Meeting points must be established between fields of specialization and languages. I mentioned earlier that every language embodies a number of commonly shared universal components and the development of scientific and technical terminology, in particular, is creating new international forms of expression and communication. This is very encouraging, though it may also become a cause of impoverishment and, if a universal language were ever to become a reality, the very notion of exchange would lose its *raison d'être.* Similarly in the field of architecture co-operation would loose all meaning if the cities of the world were to become, as they seem to be doing already, conglomerates of uniform glass and cement cubes. Only if we can preserve the special architectural and linguistic characteristics of a region, a republic or a continent, will tourism and inter-university co-operation continue to have a purpose.

The vocation of IAU is one of exchange based on reciprocity and respect for independence within a world-wide framework of interdependence, and it was certainly not by chance that its Administrative Board made its very appropriate choice of Belgrade as the meeting-place for our Seminar. Here, we are at the very heart of a nation which respects diversity and which has set up structures and frameworks designed to preserve and foster originality, even within the smallest groups of its pluralistic society. In this respect, Yugoslav political experience can serve as an example. I speak with all the more admiration, because I come from a centralized Jacobin country which is only now beginning to understand the risks embodied in excessive centralization and to make a real effort to open itself to the potentialities of federalism. But this federalist approach is also needed at the level of world affairs, and universities, by definition, are entities within a great world community of which IAU is the supreme expression.

As they try to come to terms with these new features of contemporary life—and there are others in the fields of methodology, philosophy and education—the universities are beginning to acquire a new critical dimension, and this is related to the fact that they are themselves exposed to strong criticism. The more they are criticized, the less there will be to criticize in them. This is by no means paradoxical.

We have to resolve a crisis of growth which is in reality a crisis of civilisation. Co-operation can help us to identify the real problems and to eliminate what may be described as "false" progress. We are faced by glaring and painful contradictions: developed—backward; material wealth—spiritual poverty; spiritual wealth—material poverty. Their existence sets us the difficult task of seeking common ground on which we can all come together in the certainty that the progress we have made is indeed real progress. Our scientific and technological civilisation is governed by the logic of imbalance, without which it cannot advance. This is a further reason why reciprocity in co-operation should be regarded as a means of overcoming imbalances and achieving a better control of all types of evolution, including that of our universities, and more widely, of social evolution. If this cannot be done, we know and feel what the consequences may be, and some of us are already anxious. There could be explosions, much more serious than those so far experienced, saturations

and bottlenecks which universities throughout the world must seek to prevent. Just as there was a myth of the year one thousand and an apocalyptic vision of the ending of a phase of social evolution, so today we are confronted by the myth of the year two thousand. I believe that instead of being disquieting it should be reassuring, a vision full of promise for the future. If our universities pursue reciprocity in their co-operation, we can picture them as geysers, gushing in splendid beauty, and not as volcanoes threatening the world with violent explosions and conflagration.

The range of tasks to which co-operation may be expected to make a contribution is vast and all forms of co-operation thus seem to form part of a whole. It may be instructive to make a provisional classification of the different forms of co-operation, although I believe that such classifications are artificial and only of limited value. First, there is academic co-operation between universities at the same or similar general level. It can involve universities in the advanced countries which, broadly speaking, form a block sharing the same style of co-operation, and it can involve universities in the less developed countries which also form a block with a different and original style of co-operation. But even when corresponding general levels are shared by universities in developed countries or by universities in underdeveloped countries, there are still differences within each group. One American university may specialize in atomic physics and another in biology, but both can co-operate within the American framework. And what is true of American universities is true also, for example, of universities in the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom or France. Each university achieves distinction at a particular moment in time, through the presence of an outstanding individual, perhaps a Nobel prize-winner, or a well-structured group, and because it has the means of effective communication within the structures of the developed countries. A similar phenomenon is apparent in the less developed countries. The difference in level between disciplines is less pronounced or even inexistent and exchanges between the universities of such countries may also have a scientific as well as a cultural value. Dr. Lule drew attention to the arrangements for co-operation between the Universities of Zaire and Zambia. These are two developing countries which intend to derive mutual benefit from the fact that each uses a different foreign language as the medium of instruction. In co-operating with one another, they are preparing themselves for reciprocal co-operation with universities in more developed countries. This, of course, is the second framework for reciprocal co-operation. Instead of involving universities at a similar general level of development with differences only in particular fields of study, it provides for co-operation between universities which are not at the same level. How appropriate in this context is the phrase of the sixteenth century French economist Jean Bodin, who said "the only wealth is the wealth of men."

University development in the framework of reciprocal co-operation can constitute a unique source of scientific, technological and economic progress. The purpose of reciprocity is self-evident and it occurs automatically in the first type of framework, but not in the second, where a conscious effort is demanded. But there is a third framework and I believe that it should constitute our ideal. The object is not simply to give assistance but also to develop real academic co-operation between universities of different levels. Historically, co-operation of this kind has been able to take advantage of the existence of spheres of political

and economic influence and privilege, but the nature of interuniversity relations has been transformed radically by the advent of decolonization, as has the nature of political, economic, financial and even linguistic relationships. Yesterday, it was suggested that the younger universities should try to develop their national languages as media of instruction and once again Yugoslavia has set a good example. But the phenomenon of mass communications, employing satellites, cassettes, television and radio, has created a new technological dimension for co-operation, and the ensuing revolution sometimes plunges those of us in universities into a state of uncertainty. We are afraid of losing our jobs because we are foolish enough to believe that machines can replace men; whereas in reality they are their servants and destined to obey them. And if the traditional spheres of privileged co-operation are disappearing, new ones are being established, based on new ideologies, new technical and scientific potentials and new economic stimuli.

Mr. Chairman, I have allowed myself to enlarge on these basic matters because the first speaker has already given a most competent description of the obstacles to reciprocity in co-operation. He spoke of the linguistic and psychological barriers, of those linked to lack of information and of the administrative, legal, political, scientific, economic and financial obstacles. These seem to me to constitute the most important groups of obstacles to the achievement of effective reciprocity in co-operation.

I do not wish to exceed the time allocated to me but hope, later in the discussion, to be allowed to refer in greater detail to a number of points which I will now mention very briefly. Account must always be taken of the effects of the law of supply and demand. Exchanges cannot easily be imposed, they need a certain measure of spontaneity and freedom. Account must also be taken of pressures arising from long and short term considerations related to profitability and to direct and indirect costs. These elements may combine to make reciprocity a reality or an unattainable myth. We want it to become a reality and not merely a slogan, with perhaps a political connotation.

Today, the world appears to be divided between two super-powers. A third is visible on the horizon and, in Latin America, a fourth is in the making. Europe also has great ambitions and is trying to give shape to them in the European Economic Community, even if it appears to be faced with a major crisis.

We have the good fortune to have with us the Director of the Unesco European Centre for Higher Education, an institution which has succeeded in reaching across the frontiers which formerly divided Europe. And in the narrower framework of the European Economic Community, a similar purpose is embodied in the European Institute in Florence and the plans for a European Centre for Education. All these initiatives seek to strengthen reciprocity and so enable it to overcome the obstacles listed by the first speaker.

Discussion

Professor Rybnikov, Chairman of the session, thanked the speakers for their excellent papers and opened the discussion.

Dr. Cuevas del Cid said that the expression "reciprocal co-operation" was tautological. In the absence of reciprocity, co-operation became

merely "operation". And it had to be admitted that, unfortunately, many activities undertaken in the name of co-operation were in fact unilateral operations carried out in foreign countries or foreign universities.

Good mutual knowledge was essential if this situation was to be remedied and conditions for real reciprocity created. It would therefore be desirable for IAU, helped by the universities themselves and by regional and local university bodies, to collect and publish detailed information about the various fields of study in universities throughout the world, and in particular about programmes of study and research aimed at making the social reality of the countries concerned better known.

It would also be of benefit to co-operation if closer links could be established between IAU and regional and subregional university bodies, and IAU might take the initiative in this.

Action by IAU would also be appropriate in a more specific field—that of the exchange of books and publications. In many cases, arbitrary obstacles were put in the way of their free circulation and IAU could use its authority to help eliminate them.

Reciprocity was the best way for the peoples of the world to acquire mutual knowledge and respect. It answered one of today's profoundly felt needs and was thus truly modern—which did not mean that it was "modernizing". It could help to replace "imperialism" by "fraternalism" —a world in which peoples could base their free interdependence on their independence.

Dr. Goma doubted the feasibility of collecting and publishing documentation about university study and research programmes throughout the world. It would be so voluminous and so difficult to collate that it would be out of date well before the time of its publication. Considerable effort would thus have been employed to produce a mass of useless paper. It would be wiser to begin more modestly at the regional or national level. He understood, moreover, that the universities in the United Kingdom, for example, already published a catalogue of research being undertaken by their members.

Individuals already engaged in co-operation probably represented the most valuable source of information. For example, a member of the University of Belgrade working in Zambia would become aware of the problems of the country and understand what the University was trying to achieve, and, conversely, a Zambian working in the University of Belgrade would gain a corresponding awareness and understanding. Together, they could very usefully explore possibilities of extending co-operation and, in particular, help plan exchanges of graduate students. This was the field in which reciprocity was most likely to be achieved. It should not, of course, be thought of in terms of the mechanical exchange of teachers or students of the same discipline. An exchange was also reciprocal, for example, if one partner was a physicist and the other, an Africanist.

Dr. Kirpal stressed that true reciprocity presupposed that each partner retained its individuality, and co-operation could succeed only if developing countries worked out their own models for development, corresponding to their own possibilities and aspirations. At present, they too often expended their energy in following foreign models provided by opulent consumer societies and this gave co-operation a one-sided, unreal and alienating character. There was growing awareness that

a new and separate model was required for each situation. But the elaboration of such models called in turn for a new strategy of development for universities in the third world. It was most important for them to constitute centres of creative thinking capable of devising new models and able, through the originality of their work, to command the interest of scholars and research workers in other countries. Only then would it be possible to speak of true reciprocity, particularly at the post-graduate level, which was of great importance, as had already been pointed out.

It was no use pretending, however, that there was not a lot still to be done to correct existing imbalances. India, for example, had a very ancient cultural heritage and it might be supposed that it would be able to give in the field of the humanities the counterpart of what it received in the fields of technology and science. This was only partly true, because some of the richest collections of oriental books and manuscripts were to be found in the British Museum and the Library of Congress. Thus even people of the East had to go to the West to study the culture of their own countries. But in many fields, such journeys abroad were not satisfactory. Students returned impregnated with foreign models and were often unable to free themselves to discover new ones.

Attempts had been made to improve the situation. Some years ago, for example, Unesco had launched a major project on the mutual appreciation of eastern and western cultural values. This had been specially designed to enlarge the cultural horizon of westerners, too exclusively limited by their greco-roman heritage. The project had had considerable success in a number of areas, but it was doubtful whether it had changed the situation as profoundly as had been hoped.

Too great importance should not be attached to language as an obstacle to co-operation. Men motivated and really desirous of working together could always manage to understand one another. The example provided by Indian graduates studying in the Soviet Union without previous knowledge of Russian was encouraging. The difficulty was, however, much greater in the case of undergraduate students.

Mr. GRIFFITHS pointed out that there did exist perfectly symmetrical forms of exchange, under which a professor of physics from University A, for example, replaced a colleague at University B, who in turn took his place at University A. But reciprocity did not have to be based on this kind of symmetry which generally responded rather inadequately to the needs of universities which sought from abroad what they did not have at home and which might therefore prefer to exchange a teacher of African history for a research biologist. In such cases, the benefit was still mutual, and the reciprocity was no less real than in the case of a symmetrical exchange.

A second point merited attention. People often spoke as though developing countries necessarily had developing universities, and developed countries, developed universities. This was by no means always true. There were some excellent universities in poor countries and doubtless also some rather poor universities in rich countries. The University of Ibadan, for example, was a very good university, not only in relation to Nigeria's requirements, but in relation to international standards.

Lastly, it was necessary to reach a clearer understanding about the supposed perniciousness of foreign models. When a university was established in a country which formerly had none, it had to be provided with

a structure, a system of administration, and coherent courses of study, and for this, recourse was usually had to a foreign model. A compromise based on several different systems was unlikely to prove satisfactory. What was important was for the new university to know how to develop from this model along lines consonant with the needs of its society and culture. There were many examples of universities evolving in this way from a sound starting point. One of particular interest was the small University of Mauritius, which, although originally designed on a British model, had been exposed to French university culture.

Mr. STACKPOLE, wishing to contribute to the "critical" approach which the Seminar had been asked to adopt, warned against certain forms of co-operation. Governments, technical assistance agencies and certain foundations professed a great devotion to co-operation and this devotion itself called for special vigilance. Such large bodies had a liking for spectacular action which would have far-reaching effects. At times they were not averse to exercising a monopoly in a particular field. They were tempted to define their own policy of co-operation and then to impose it by refusing to give assistance to projects which did not fall within the framework they had established. Experience had shown that this could be very harmful and stifle the initiative of the universities or countries which were to be helped.

Dr. Kirpal had pointed out that developing countries now needed to set up their own centres of excellence, of graduate studies and of research. They should not be hindered in this by organizations which felt, on the contrary, that it was more rational to send third world students to pursue advanced studies in the industrialized countries. It was time to abandon the policy of "take it or leave it" in matters of co-operation. Instead of saying: "This is how you are going to develop because you haven't the means to develop any other way", efforts should be made to find the most intelligent ways of helping universities and countries to develop as they thought best.

Professor GLIGORIJEVIĆ emphasized that one of the characteristics of the present day was an increasing tendency towards the interdependence of societies. The rôle of universities was not to slow down this movement but, on the contrary, to take part in it, ensuring as far as possible that it took place in conditions of justice and mutual respect. Reciprocal co-operation was one way of achieving this. But, as several speakers had pointed out, reciprocity did not call for identity of offer and counter-offer. As a general rule, reciprocity should be conceived in the context of individual faculties. Account could thus be taken of all potential areas of co-operation. The University of Belgrade, for example, was a complex body constituted by twenty-six faculties and it was thus able to provide a broad basis for a wide range of programmes of co-operation. Of course, reciprocity could only be regarded as being authentic if a feeling of complete equality existed between the partners, regardless of the degree of development of their respective countries or institutions. However, this feeling of equality was not sufficient in itself. It had to be accompanied by thorough mutual knowledge and, given the complexity of universities and of contemporary university systems, this was not always easy to acquire. It was therefore necessary to provide for adequate preliminary contact and mutual exchanges of information before agreements were concluded.

Dr. RIBBING noted that the Seminar had so far devoted attention mainly to reciprocity in bilateral and multilateral relations between universities wishing to exchange services. The structures of reciprocity could, however, be much more complex, notably when they also involved the participation of non-university bodies, and in particular of international organizations. This was a matter which had not been studied at all adequately, and there was need for far more systematic research. International organizations often embarked on programmes without having made more than a superficial analysis of the requirements for their success. Marketing studies and other surveys which preceded the launching of certain commercial products often seemed to be much more thorough. Perhaps the Centre for Higher Education in Bucharest and IAU could collaborate in making detailed studies of matters such as the purposes of co-operation, the structures of reciprocity, and the rôle of international organizations.

It should be added that reciprocity did not always involve an exchange of services, it could also arise from multiple exchanges and "feed-back" effects generated through participation in a joint programme. This was also an aspect of reciprocity which merited study.

Professor Rybnikov, Chairman of the session, thanked the speakers and closed the session.

FRAMEWORKS FOR CO-OPERATION

M. Beutler took the chair and pointed out that although the examination of institutional frameworks for co-operation would no doubt be more technical in character than that of the significance of co-operation or the basic idea of reciprocity, it should nevertheless constitute a continuation of the preceding basic discussions. He then gave the floor to Dr. Amnuay.

Dr. AMNUAY TAPINGKAE

Director, Regional Institute of Higher Education and Development, Singapore

Introduction

The university, like a living organism, must always seek to grow, to adapt, and to change. It must also possess a "will to live" and must develop a "courage to be". This means that the university must will to live purposefully and to live courageously. It must think clearly of its mission and purposes. It must carry out its mission faithfully and effectively. At the same time, the university must be renewed to meet new challenges and requirements of the times.

Like a human being, the university cannot exist in isolation. It must always seek to relate itself to other communities and widen its environment. It cannot afford to be an isolated intellectual community but must always strive for deeper meaning in its relatedness to others.

The university as an intellectual community cannot perform its mission effectively unless it seeks to widen its horizon. In serving its immediate environment, the university must always seek to become a universal community. I cannot but support the statement that "the university has also a distinct responsibility to promote universal values and to serve mankind as a whole" *.

In agreeing wholeheartedly with this statement, I feel, at the same time, very sad, because I realize that while some institutions of higher learning, because of their strength and resourcefulness, are able to fulfil their universal missions, others may not even be able to look beyond their own narrow provincialism. Be this as it may, it is hoped that inter-university co-operation will help strengthen both types of institution. Through co-operation, sharing and mutual support become possible.

---

* *International University Co-operation*, IAU *Paper No* 9 ; **Paris 1969**, x + 161 p.

Some basic considerations

In order to foster meaningful co-operation, I wish to offer the following considerations.

1. *Mutual Acceptance*

Acceptance is not only significant in inter-personal relations but also in inter-university relations. When two institutions or two parties co-operate, there must be mutual acceptance as a prerequisite. Each must have a realistic view of the other—of its strength as well as its weaknesses, of its successes as well as its failures. Through a realistic view of both parties, mutual acceptance and respect arise.

2. *Sharing*

Sharing, like charity, must begin at home. The university must learn to seek sharing among its many departments, colleges, research institutes, faculty and staff. This intra-university sharing expands into inter-university sharing. It is not sufficient if only the Vice-Chancellor or Rector, or President of an institution co-operates with his counterpart in another institution or institutions. The total university must be involved, either directly or indirectly. This means that at least key personnel must be part of the co-operative venture.

3. *Outreach*

It is very easy for the university to be so busy with the "university works" that it forgets the "works" of the university. Like any organization, it may put its time and effort into self-servicing and fail to fulfil the mission and objective for which it exists. In reaching out beyond itself, the university can be *strengthened*. In its "outreach" programme, the university must also know its limitations.

4. *Strengthening*

The more institutions of higher learning co-operate with each other, the stronger they become. Before any institutions begin their co-operative projects, they must recognize both the "give" and "take" aspects. They should learn to give in the areas in which they may have strength, and to receive in areas in which they have weaknesses. The institutions will become strengthened both in giving and receiving.

Frameworks for co-operation

1. *Institutional Co-operation*

One institution can seek out another institution or many institutions with which to co-operate. In Southeast Asian countries, it is not unusual for institutions of higher learning to know more of their overseas counterparts and to co-operate more with them than institutions in their own country or in other countries of the region. This was perhaps influenced by the history of Southeast Asia. However, it is encouraging to note that there has been an increase in inter-institutional co-operation within each of the Southeast Asian countries and within the region as a whole. In spite of this encouraging sign, one should not minimize the fact that psychologically and socially, it is easier for an Asian institution to co-operate with its Western counterparts.

It is important for Asian universities to co-operate more closely with each other, not only to start new programmes together but also to avoid unnecessary duplication and wastage, especially when institutions happen to be located in the same region. Each university must be encouraged to formulate its own philosophy and maintain its own uniqueness. It should not seek to duplicate the work of others. This is not very easy since Asian universities, like their counterparts anywhere in the world, give high priority to status and prestige. This status and prestige syndrome seems to be founded more on the idea that the bigger the university becomes, the more prestige it receives in the eyes of the public, than the idea of its uniqueness and specific mission. Consequently, a small university seeks to become larger, a technical college seeks to become a full university, and an "open" university may want to become a selective institution. Thus, they no longer exist in accord with the purposes for which they were originally created. If an institution wants to become like the others, institutional co-operation becomes difficult and rivalries arise.

2. *National Level*

In many Southeast Asian countries, there is a strong national co-ordinating body. Through this central body, planning and co-operation among universities in the country are possible, and duplication of programmes should be minimized, not totally avoided. The existence of such a body, in fact, facilitates inter-university co-operation. This central body acts as a liaison for institutions, both governmental and private.

3. *Regional Level*

With reference to Southeast Asia, regional co-operation between Southeast Asian universities is a recent phenomenon. This regional awareness has come about because of national independence and as a consequence of the need for more economic, political and also educational co-operation. Southeast Asian universities have begun to realize that their counterparts in the region have many things to offer and also have many things to gain. They realize that strong programmes and innovations in higher education exist in the region. They also realize that governments co-operate more closely with each other through regional organizations such as ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations), SEAMEO (Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization). Consequently, institutions of higher learning can no longer remain indifferent onlookers to this new development.

In my own experience at the Regional Institute of Higher Education and Development (RIHED), I have been very much encouraged by the degree of co-operation that has taken place and is taking place in the Southeast Asian region today. As many of you already know, the Regional Institute of Higher Education and Development or RIHED was established in 1970 by the Governments of Indonesia, the Khmer Republic, Laos, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and Viet-Nam, as a result of the recommendation of the Steering Committee for the UNESCO/IAU Joint Research Programme in Higher Education. For the development of a concerted programme of research in higher education in Southeast Asia, the Joint Steering Committee, with the collaboration of the Ford Foundation, initiated a study of the "Rôle of Institutions of Higher Education in the Development of Countries in Southeast Asia". The study began in 1961 and a Summary Report on the work and the conclusions emerging from it

was published in 1965, and the full report appeared in 1967. Among the conclusions and recommendations was a proposal for the establishment of an Institute of Higher Education and Development.

This proposal received general endorsement at the Fourth General Conference of IAU (Tokyo, August-September 1965), the Conference of Asian Ministers of Education and Ministers responsible for Economic Planning (Bangkok, November, 1965), and the General Conference of UNESCO (Paris, October-November 1966).

RIHED was established for the purpose of stimulating and facilitating co-operation among the universities and the governments of the countries in Southeast Asia, and to enhance the contributions of higher education to the social and economic development of the countries of the region and of the region as a whole. To achieve this primary objective, the activities of RIHED are focused principally on the following:

(i) To provide statistical, clearing-house and documentation services;

(ii) To conduct or arrange for the conduct and publication of studies of ways to extend the contributions of universities to development and of the functioning and organization of universities in this role;

(iii) To sponsor seminars and conferences;

(iv) To provide advisory and technical services;

(v) To co-operate with other agencies whose objectives are related to the objectives of the Institute; and

(vi) To encourage and facilitate inter-university and inter-country co-operation in the planning and conduct of mutually beneficial projects in higher education and development.

Because RIHED enjoys the support of the governments of member countries, co-operation from member countries has been significantly high. RIHED has been able to bring both the governments and the universities closer together and, at the same time, RIHED is able to bring many institutions of higher learning in Southeast Asia both within the countries and within the region as a whole to know each other better and to co-operate with each other more closely. RIHED workshops have been enthusiastically attended by participants from the region, and follow-up activities of these regional workshops have been very satisfactory. RIHED research projects have been well received and it is not too difficult to find researchers in member countries to co-operate in them. It is hoped that RIHED as a catalytic agency can promote more co-operation in the region of Southeast Asia.

In its first four years of existence and operation, RIHED has hitherto accomplished several specific tasks.

(i) RIHED has collected in its library over two thousand volumes of current studies related to higher education and development, either published by other agencies or by itself. It is hoped that the documentation services of RIHED will be strengthened when more studies and surveys are undertaken and completed. Specifically, RIHED's project on *Directory of Selected Scholars and Researchers in Southeast Asia* (expected date of completion: April 1974) will greatly enhance this service. This Directory will be the first of its kind to be completed in Southeast Asia.

(ii) RIHED has published several significant regional research studies on the rôle of institutions of higher education in national development in Southeast Asia. Some of these are: *Rôle of Universities in National Development Planning in Southeast Asia* (September 1971); *Rôle of Universities in Management Education for National Development in Southeast Asia* (March 1972); and *Rôle of Universities in Local and Regional Development* (February 1973). In addition, several papers have been published and distributed.

(iii) RIHED sponsors at least one major regional workshop a year. This workshop is attended both by representatives of governments of member countries and by representatives of the university community. Exchange of ideas has been very fruitful. Through such deliberations it is hoped that the government agencies and the universities will work more closely with each other so that optimal utilization of resources for national development can be ensured. Because of the catalytic rôle of RIHED, several recommendations from RIHED regional workshops have been adopted and implemented in many member countries. In addition to regional workshops, RIHED also sponsors national seminars and follow-up research studies on specific problems.

(iv) RIHED is co-operating with other organizations, both regional and international. For example, RIHED works closely with SEAMEO, ASAIHL (Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning), UNESCO, IAU, IDRC (International Development Research Centre), and ICED (International Council for Educational Development)—both in terms of general contacts and specific joint projects.

(v) RIHED also serves as a co-ordinator of several projects which facilitate inter-university co-operation in the region. For example, higher education institutions in the Khmer Republic will send a team to Indonesia to study the use of national language in the universities. It is hoped that through such co-operation mutual benefits will result.

I am convinced that the Southeast Asian universities, perhaps in their long association with their counterparts in the Western Hemisphere, have begun to be aware of their counterparts in the same region. The Southeast Asian universities want to make the best of this awareness and look beyond their own limitations—linguistic, cultural as well as political barriers—to understand their counterparts and their region better. I am very much encouraged by new developments in regional co-operation.

As I stated earlier, the university must always seek to grow, to adapt, and to change. It must effectively seek to fulfil its tasks. In order to grow and to perform its mission effectively, it must also seek to relate itself to the wider community. It must seek to develop a will to become a universal community.

Let us hope that this is a possible dream.

M. Beutler, Chairman of the session, thanked the speaker and asked the participants if they had any questions to put. He himself would be grateful for some explanation of the way in which regional co-operation operated between RIHED, ASAIHL and SEAMEO.

Dr. AMNUAY said that ASAIHL was a purely university organization, whose members were institutions of higher education, whereas SEAMEO was an intergovernmental organization. RIHED was also to a large extent an intergovernmental body, but its major rôle was to create a meeting place between the university world and government circles where important decisions were made concerning the future of higher education. While ASAIHL concentrated on the study of problems affecting the internal life of universities, for example, language problems, RIHED had a broader approach directed to the rôle of the university as such, in economic and social development. The two organizations were complementary and took great care to co-ordinate their activities. It should also be added that the rôle of RIHED was essentially that of a catalyst. It did not have executive powers, but sought to contribute to the advancement of thinking on selected problems. It was up to each country to draw the conclusions it thought appropriate from RIHED reports. The discussions initiated by RIHED at the regional level were often continued at the national level.

Mr. AITKEN added that SEAMEO and ASAIHL were both represented on the Governing Board of RIHED (as also were Unesco and IAU, though without voting rights). RIHED thus constituted a new kind of institution involving organic co-operation between governments and universities at the regional level. In the range of frameworks for co-operation, it constituted an innovation, opening the way for new forms of reciprocity.

In reply to a question from Dr. DEL POZO, Dr. AMNUAY gave a number of technical explanations about the rôle played by Unesco, IAU and the Ford Foundation in the creation of the Institute.

M. Beutler then called on Dr. Holland to present his paper.

Dr. KENNETH HOLLAND

Former President, Institute of International Education, New York

1. My statement is based primarily on the experience of American universities since I am more familiar with the work of these institutions than those of any other country.

2. My conclusions, however, are reached after the administration of international educational exchange programmes during the 23 years that I was President of the Institute of International Education; the five years that I was in charge of educational and cultural programmes in the Office of Inter-American Affairs, and five years in the Department of State, the last two as permanent U.S. Representative to Unesco in Paris.

3. Until the period following the Second World War university co-operation had largely been on an informal, unorganized basis. The individual student sought out the professor of his choice in another university, sometimes in his own country but often in another. The researcher also went to the library or laboratory best suited to his needs. Professors were invited to other universities to bring their particular type of knowledge or experience to that institution. The wandering student, the visiting professor or researcher established important links between and among

the great intellectual centres of the world and contributed to an exchange across national boundaries of knowledge and experience.

4. This type of educational exchange influenced greatly the trends in higher education in the United States. For instance we modelled our graduate schools after the ones in Germany, our undergraduate colleges were largely copied from Oxford and Cambridge. These were the days before the confusing and often misused terms of developed and underdeveloped or developing countries. All countries were developing then as they are now.

5. Immediately after the Second World War inter-university co-operation became a large movement, if not always well planned and directed. Too frequently this co-operation involved mediocre universities that, with the support of their Congressmen rather than the academic community, obtained contracts which they thought would help them financially, give their professors experience abroad (frequently the man who could not adjust at home was thought to be the person for overseas assignment) and at the same time bring interest, prestige and some knowledge of foreign countries to the home institution.

6. In recent years the typical way that United States universities have co-operated is through bi-lateral agreements between two institutions, one the giving and the other receiving. In the United States these programmes have been financed largely by the Federal Government with short-term appropriated funds. There were often misunderstandings in working out such agreements. Also they were inflexible due in part to the governmental regulations. Other problems with this type of relationship were:

(a) Often the best qualified universities did not want to take on the responsibility for such a programme, especially since it involved becoming a recipient or at least a channel for funds from a governmental agency, with all the red tape and procedures that it implied. American Higher Education has for many decades been wary of Federal Government control of universities by the purse strings.

(b) Those universities that did take on this responsibility soon realized that to carry out such a programme would take their best talent away from the university and that in any case there were not enough qualified members of their faculties and administration to carry out such a programme. This made it necessary to go out and recruit personnel from other institutions or from the public at large. The best professors might go abroad for a year or two but not for longer periods, either because the university needed them on campus to teach the students there or the professors wanted to continue their careers in their own countries. It was hard for the professor abroad to carry on the work of his specialty since his laboratory, his library, his collaborators were at his home university.

(c) The universities undertaking this kind of work have usually been dependent on annual or at best two year governmental appropriations so there was little possibility of planned continuity. AID in recent years has been defined as struggling to meet twenty year needs with a three to five programme with two year tenured personnel on annual appropriations.

(d) Universities have not always been intereste in continuing the contracts once the glamour of living and working abroad had been worn off. They have also found it hard to carry on such programmes under U.S. governmental regulations without contributing funds from their own limited budgets.

Universities must always be the chief source of trained personnel for any international educational programme and also the institutions that educate or train those to carry on such activities. There are, however, better ways in my opinion to administer such international educational programmes on the university level than through universities.

In the course of my work since 1935, but especially since 1941, I have attempted to understand and evaluate through personal experience the variously administered international programmes. They have included programmes administered by the Organization of American States, the Rockefeller, Ford and Kellogg foundations, Unesco, the World Bank, the United Nations Development Programme, the Inter-American Development Bank and a few multinational corporations. I have not made an intensive study of such programmes. My opinions are based on my own observations, discussions and the studies, reports and evaluations of other people.

All of these international organizations have certainly made some contributions to international educational programmes but have faced problems that have to a greater or lesser degree handicapped their effectiveness. However, the best administered programmes, in my opinion, all of them aided by university personnel, have been those of the Rockefeller Foundation. My conclusion concerning this Foundation is not made because it is American nor because the funds were amassed by a huge corporation under the capitalistic system. I came to this conclusion from long observation and association with this organization. It has on the whole been intelligently administered by carefully selected professional staff, many of them non-American.

The reasons why the Rockefeller Foundation has succeeded are:

1. The Foundation has had the assurance of long range financing on a generous level. With several hundred millions of dollars in the portfolio of this foundation, it could commit $100,000,000 to a programme of inter-university co-operation and be sure of its availability over a 15 to 20 year or even longer period of time.

2. It could wait for countries to come to it with plans and programmes that the country had developed and wanted to carry out. The careful planning of the activities over a period of months on the initiative of the requesting country was one of their cardinal principles.

3. The Foundation could also be sure of funds to carry out the programme after the plan was finalized. In many countries of the world there are numerous plans and programmes that are based on long, drawn-out studies which were never implemented.

4. The Rockefeller Foundation was able to attract and keep high calibre personnel who were willing to devote a major part of their lives, if not their entire careers, to these international educational projects.

5. This Foundation did not agree to undertake a project unless the institution and the government of the country were committed to the

project and had and were willing to make available personnel capable of playing a dominant rôle in the project and eventually taking it over.

6. The Foundation planned and carried on its programmes with the specific objective of working itself out of a job. This required the training of a staff of nationals of the country for the responsibilities of the project or projects. Some ten thousand fellowships for this type of training programme were made available by the Foundation.

7. Through such a fellowship programme personnel were sent to the country or institution best able to give that individual the necessary training for a specific job back home. By choosing carefully able persons and training them for existing jobs at home, they did, in almost every case, return home.

This is a summary of the work of the Rockefeller Foundation in its international educational programmes. No country should copy an institution from another. But it seems to me that administrative policies of this Foundation should be studied to see which aspects of its operations could or should be used elsewhere.

There are, of course, other institutions that should be studied in developing an administrative mechanism better suited than the university itself to carry on such programmes. The Institute of International Education is another example, the Ford Foundation, the Kellogg Foundation and other public and private institutions should be considered. I am sure that at this meeting I shall learn about other institutions in other countries that have successfully carried on this type of international education on the higher education level.

Discussion

M. Beutler, Chairman of the session, thanked Dr. Holland and opened the discussion.

Dr. DEL POZO, replying to a question put by Dr. Holland, outlined the structure of university co-operation in Latin America. In addition to the Union of Universities of Latin America (UDUAL), there were the Organization of Catholic Universities of Latin America, and two Central American regional bodies: CSUCA, which brought together the national universities, and FUPAC, which grouped the private universities.

The principal activities of UDUAL were concerned with meetings and publications. Apart from its General Assemblies, which took place every three years, and the annual meetings of its Board, it regularly organized meetings between corresponding faculties in the region and, from time to time, important colloquia on topics such as university planning or university extension.

Among its publications, special mention might be made of the quarterly *Universidades* and of the collection of statistical information about university life in Latin America *(Censo)*; the next edition of this, covering the years 1973-1974, would be published in 1975.

Unesco was considering the establishment of a regional centre in Latin America which would have the function of increasing contacts between governments. It was to be hoped, however, that this would not duplicate

the efforts of the existing organizations, which were already carrying out important work in the field of information.

Lastly, UDUAL had no relationship with the Organization of American States.

Dr. GOMA asked for details of the working methods of the consortia of American universities and, in particular, whether they consulted the prospective beneficiaries before establishing their programmes.

Dr. HOLLAND replied that consultations certainly took place, but he could not immediately give detailed information about them.

Mr. STACKPOLE confirmed that the consortia were aware of the needs of the universities with which they wished to co-operate. It was true, nevertheless, that there existed no central body in the United States able to handle requests and assess the needs of co-operation as a whole. The organization *Education and World Affairs* had tried to play this rôle some years ago but, in the absence of sufficient financial support, it had had to close down. This left a gap which some people felt to be very serious.

Dr. KIRPAL said that India had had a very satisfactory experience of co-operation with a consortium of American universities in setting up one of its Institutes of Technology, all of which had been established with assistance from foreign countries. This had been an AID programme, but it had been carried out by the consortium, which had set up a joint committee with Indian colleagues. The ensuing fruitful dialogue had later led to long-term co-operation. Academic co-operation had been excellent although there had been administrative difficulties because Indian and American management methods were very different. On the whole, the balance-sheet had been very positive and the consortium formula should be encouraged.

Turning to other frameworks for co-operation and beginning with the international one, IAU itself constituted a privileged instrument which should be strengthened, for it did not seem to have sufficient resources to deal with the wide range of functions which it could be called upon to assume.

At the level of the individual institution, even quite modest initiatives could help to make students more aware of co-operation and of international university solidarity. Indian universities sometimes had offices which provided information about study abroad but now that almost all disciplines could be studied in India, these offices had lost some of their usefulness. They could, however, be enlarged and transformed, and instead of providing technical information about courses and admissions requirements, could inform students about the life of universities in other countries. Good documentary films, for example, would interest students and awake in them a sense of belonging to an international community. More generally, modern techniques of communication, and particularly television, could be used much more than at present to promote co-operation.

At the national level, mention might be made of a scheme set up by the Indian *University Grants Commission* to seek out some of the country's

best university teachers and provide funds for them to make lecture tours of other universities. Action of this kind could perhaps also be developed internationally.

Regional co-operation could be particularly fruitful and appeared to be quite well structured in some regions, such as Southeast Asia. Unfortunately this was not true for Asia as a whole, and in particular for South Asia, because of political difficulties which were well known. Efforts had nevertheless been made, and contacts were maintained between universities in India, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh, notably by means of the *Inter-University Board*.

Among the very practical measures to stimulate teacher and student mobility, it might be possible to envisage a campaign for specially reduced air fares and for a fund to provide the necessary foreign currency.

Lastly, efforts might be made to develop informal programmes which could bring together groups of individuals in various regions to discuss the present problems of society, of the university and of culture and also to establish links between the groups to compare and contrast the results achieved. Such activities would not involve great expenditure and might be supported by foundations, which now seemed less eager to finance major aid programmes.

Dr. CUEVAS DEL CID briefly described the Confederation of Universities of Central America (CSUCA), founded in 1948, which brought together the national universities of several countries in the region. The Confederation sought to promote co-operation between its members and help them to carry out their mission in relation to Central American society. It also tried to be open to the outside world, but not at the price of compromising the independence of its members.

Dr. RIBBING spoke of the tasks which the Unesco European Centre for Higher Education in Bucharest was called upon to perform. These were very wide-ranging in relation to the resources allocated to it. They involved setting up a documentation and information centre on higher education; undertaking studies of selected subjects and publishing the results; and promoting the mobility of academic staff and students in the region.

In order to understand the particular conditions under which the Centre was working, it must be realized that a number of countries in the region had institutes for research into higher education which were well equipped with material and personnel (whereas the Centre employed only four people at the professional level) and that other governmental and non-governmental organizations (FAO, WHO, OECD, the Council of Europe and, of course, IAU and CRE) were also concerned with particular aspects of university co-operation and higher education. It was obvious that the Centre could not compete with them all. It should, rather, derive strength from their existence while seeking to define its own particular rôle.

The Centre had, therefore, set out to collect and catalogue information about activities and projects of these organizations, so as to be better able to integrate its own activities and derive the greatest benefit from existing possibilities for co-operation.

In the present preparatory phase, the Centre was also trying, in direct consultation with the interested institutions, to identify a number of problems and their ramifications and to make a systematic analysis of them with the object of identifying the types of action which might be called for.

In 1974, the Centre would study and organize seminars on problems of higher education statistics and on the internal efficiency of higher education.

Projects for 1975 included studies of structural problems of technical and medical education; of post-graduate study; and of the relationships between higher education and the labour market. These would all be undertaken in collaboration with the relevant national bodies. An enquiry into the internationalization of higher education, for example, would be based on a Swedish draft report, and a study concerning the labour market would be carried out in collaboration with the *Institut für Hochschulplanung* in the German Democratic Republic.

One of the most difficult problems facing the Centre, in view of its limited size and resources, was that of making direct contact with the 1,700 institutions of higher education which it was expected to help develop.

M. Beutler, Chairman of the session, said that it was unfortunately time to close the discussion. It had been most instructive factually but might not have given sufficient critical consideration to the various frameworks for co-operation and their relationships with one another. Perhaps the subject could be taken up again during the general discussion on Thursday.

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF CO-OPERATION

Mr. Griffiths took the chair and gave the floor to Professor Gligorijević.

PROFESSOR JOVAN GLIGORIJEVIĆ *

Rector, University of Belgrade

One of the basic features of the contemporary world is the co-existence of organized social, regional and international communities. This co-existence stimulates recognition of the need for them to draw closer together.

The development of human society is today characterized not only by important scientific advances into the unknown and by the discovery of new laws governing nature and society, but also by their application in the development of the means of production and by changes of balance within the productive process. The presence of science in all spheres of human endeavour, as a factor integrating diverse forms of human activity and as man's most powerful and effective tool for the further transformation of humanity, is synonymous with the modernity of our epoch. The application of scientific discoveries and knowledge has produced undreamt-of changes but it has also widened the gap between developed and undeveloped communities and nations. In such conditions, the interplay between science, human labour and the development of societies reveals the urgency of the need for continued and deeper understanding between peoples and states and for the further development of co-operation between them. This need for the universal integration of peoples and societies lends special significance to the rôle of science and education—the production and the diffusion of knowledge.

Through its creative work—its engagement in the advancement of science and knowledge and in the training of the specialists needed by society—the university exerts a determining influence on the development of human society.

The concept of the modern university is one of an institution representing a significant concentration of scientific and teaching potential and a high degree of unity between systematized knowledge and the individuals who will apply that knowledge and expose it to the test of practical social, economic and cultural experience. The importance of the university also results from the fact that its teaching spans a broad range of knowledge thus fitting its graduates not only to employ new technological processes to improve the means of production, but also to contribute to the development of the productive process and of human relations for the further humanization of society.

---

* *Paper translated from the Serbo-Croat.*

For the university to be able to perform its functions in present-day conditions, there must be a clear definition of the relationship between it and society, ensuring freedom of creation and communication as well as the permanent integration of scientific achievement and social practice, and their mutual interaction.

The significance of the rôle of universities in contemporary society and the extent of their influence on the development of particular communities are such that international university co-operation (the exchange of scientific knowledge, of educational experience, and of men and means) can only develop successfully and be of mutual benefit to those concerned if it is carried out in the context of clearly defined objectives and requirements. In other words, certain pre-determined conditions must be observed in the conduct of co-operation.

The most important prerequisites for successful university co-operation can be formulated on the basis of the principles, aims and purposes of the United Nations, and of its charters, decisions and recommendations which seek to maintain peace, and to promote social development, justice and a better living standard for the whole of humanity. By promoting respect for human rights and basic freedoms for all, regardless of race, sex, tongue or creed, and by upholding the dignity and value of the human personality, as well as the right to education and participation in the scientific process —a basis can be built for the development of mutual appreciation between large social communities.

These basic principles for university co-operation acquire special importance in the existing structure of international social and economic relations which is marked by great differences in the level of development of the various parts of the globe, and of regions, states, peoples and universities. The advances of science and technology undoubtedly provide an excellent base for efforts to overcome economic and cultural backwardness and poverty, but they also lead to a widening and deepening of the gap between the developed and undeveloped countries.

Interdependence is today a prominent characteristic of the international community and this facilitates and contributes to the development and establishment of forms of international university co-operation which are widely accepted and which are directed towards the overall social development of those concerned.

These general observations would be out of place in so distinguished a gathering of university people, but for the fact that they form part of the basic orientation of the University of Belgrade, which has based the development of its international university co-operation on the belief that science and education are simultaneously both national and universal.

It is against this background that I would like to refer to several ideas and concepts which may be of interest and serve as an introduction to the discussion of "Criteria for the Evaluation of Co-operation."

When analysing the critical approach to international university co-operation and when examining the criteria for appraising the results of this co-operation, two aspects can be distinguished—the general (that of substance and content) and the methodological, although the complexity of the question makes it difficult to define them sharply.

The general aspect of international university co-operation encompasses all that has already been said on this important subject, whether directed to the purposes and significance or to the forms and frameworks of university co-operation. Nevertheless, it must be emphasized that

international university co-operation, regardless of the purpose, form or framework, can only be implemented successfully if it is a reflection of the basic principles which are common to all the members of the world community and which endow them with equal rights. Therefore, when appraising the conditions for carrying out a particular programme of international university co-operation, and when assessing the results achieved, we must first ask whether it is based on the principle of equality —starting from the equal rights of peoples and nations, and of universities and their departments, right through to the equal rights of the individuals participating directly in co-operation. Consequently, differences of race, language, culture and socio-political, ideological and religious convictions must be respected at all times and at all levels; the right of the individual to enjoy freedom of thought, belief and expression, to undertake research, and to make use of knowledge acquired, must be safeguarded; and intervention in the internal affairs of the university and in the organization of relationships such as those at the institutional and faculty levels must be avoided. Beyond the need to take account of these basic principles and of obvious differences in levels of development, there must also be a readiness to co-ordinate mutual interests in co-operation. This is of particular importance when determining the objectives and forms of co-operation between environments and universities at different stages of development. And this is why it is necessary to establish mutual relationships which exclude and make impossible all forms of subservience, in scientific, technological and economic no less than in personal relations.

The need for international university co-operation is particularly evident in the fields of science where the organization of scientific documentation and of research institutions demands increasing specialization and wide co-operation. This presupposes equal rights and the proper use of common sources of information and of exchanges of information. In this connection equal rights to make use of results of work undertaken are of particular importance. Each partner in international university co-operation must have the sovereign right to decide under what conditions he will take part in co-operation and what use he will make of the products of co-operation.

In order to reach clear definitions of the objectives, forms and frameworks of co-operation, and to appraise the general and specific results of co-operation, account must be taken of a variety of factors. These include: the complexity of the relationships and other conditions in which international university co-operation has to be carried out as well as the need for co-ordination in the use of terminology employed to describe the various concepts related to so complex an institution as the contemporary university and its specific characteristics, which are themselves conditioned by the level of its development and the environment from which it emerged. This is all directly related to the methodology of co-operation. The institutionalization of co-operation through the conclusion of agreements (whether at the international, bilateral, university, faculty or individual level) is a technical prerequisite which has a considerable bearing on the success of co-operation. In our experience the substance of international university co-operation, the course of its development and the results achieved can all be influenced considerably by such technical matters.

A proper evaluation of international university co-operation can be made only if the purposes, forms, frameworks and conditions of co-operation are clearly defined, and this presupposes that co-operation is preceded

by mutual exchanges of information on the prospects of carrying out programmes and on the purposes they are to serve.

The parameters which should serve as a point of departure for determining the conditions for programmes of co-operation and for assessing the results achieved include the following:

(a) the socio-economic situation of the university, nationally and internationally;

(b) the structure of the university and the level of development of its scholarship and teaching;

(c) the relationship between the university and the community and the extent of its autonomy;

(d) the status of its components (academic staff, non-academic staff and students) in the work process, in management and in decision-making, as well as their mutual relationships;

(e) experience of international university co-operation and the forms and extent of international contacts.

Each of these parameters represents a complex problem which merits particular examination. We believe that they help to create objective conditions for the conduct of international university co-operation. The partners participating in co-operation must know each other; this is a particularly important precondition for defining the purposes, forms and extent of co-operation as well as for evaluating the results achieved.

The parameters should apply equally to all participating in co-operation. But this by no means implies that co-operation should only take place between universities with equal potentialities, similar levels of development and equivalent parameters. On the contrary, the definition and understanding of these elements, which are of importance for all co-operation, should be of help in reaching clear formulations of purposes, forms, frameworks and mutual relationships, particularly when co-operation is to take place between developed and undeveloped universities and faculties. The parameters retain their importance regardless of the field of inter-university co-operation, be it concerned with pure or applied research, with genetics, with the training of high-level manpower or the transfer of technology...

International university co-operation undoubtedly constitutes a very important element of general development, but it is also a key factor contributing to the growth of mutual knowledge and to the strengthening of links between university institutions and their members. In the past its development has been very largely a spontaneous process in which university teachers and research workers have constituted the main links, and provided the stimulus. The broad social responsibility of the contemporary university makes it desirable for co-operation to be based on formal agreements and contracts which define clearly its purpose, scope and framework. We believe that co-operation should be formalized in this way, especially when it involves joint undertakings and investments, and factors such as the concentration of staff and technical resources and joint research.

In the area of co-operation in the training of high-level manpower, the content of specialized training is becoming increasingly universal in its application, not only because of the demands of contemporary social

and economic development but also as a consequence of migratory movements of experts and of labour, tourism and other forms of communication. Institutional norms and frameworks for university co-operation should be included as integral parts of agreements on co-operation, and be accompanied by effective observation of the general and basic principles of co-operation.

If international university co-operation is organized and regulated in this way, valid criteria can be established for assessing the results of joint action. In fact, a clear definition of the purposes, forms and scope of co-operation, and of the frameworks and conditions for co-operation, itself embodies certain criteria which result from a synthesis of the general principles of the conditions for co-operation and of its consequences.

The wide range of interests and needs, and the inexhaustible possibilities for international university co-operation, make it pointless to attempt to draw up a detailed list of criteria for the evaluation of co-operation. However, evaluation should not be allowed to confine itself exclusively to assessing the contribution of co-operation to academic life, although this is our primary concern, because the contemporary university constitutes part of a complex social and economic mechanism which is concerned not only with academic research but also with the application and testing of the results of research in practical situations of social and economic life and production.

The complexity of the problems posed by international university co-operation, especially of those arising from the fact that it must be inserted into the fabric of contemporary society, makes it difficult to construct a simple schematic model of the methodological aspects of a critical approach to it. But practical considerations make it necessary to try to systematize criteria in order to create an objective setting for evaluation.

Although I regard the critical appraisal of inter-university co-operation as forming a whole I would like to suggest that it is possible to distinguish three categories of criteria:

(a) the first comprises what may be called the basic premises, and these are concerned with evaluating the extent to which the basic principles of all co-operation, and hence those of university co-operation, are observed;

(b) the second comprises the parameters, and these are concerned with evaluating circumstances in which co-operation is carried out;

(c) the third is made up of the elements for evaluating the extent to which the purposes of inter-university co-operation are achieved.

Although this set of categories has been drawn up for practical purposes it nevertheless remains theoretical because, to be valid, an appraisal of inter-university co-operation should in practice be based on all the factors I have mentioned. Only results achieved on the basis of clearly defined purposes and in conformity with fundamental principles can be regarded as constituting useful products of inter-university co-operation.

I very much hope that these considerations and the views I have expressed will serve as an introduction to the discussion of the important problem before us.

Mr. Griffiths thanked the speaker warmly for his paper, which he considered to be very encouraging since it helped to show that co-operation was possible between institutions belonging to the most different of worlds, providing that the purposes had been clearly defined. He then called upon Mr. Stackpole.

Mr. STEPHEN STACKPOLE

Director, Commonwealth Program,
Carnegie Corporation of New York

Since I have been asked to speak on the basis of direct personal experience with programmes of inter-university co-operation, I should say something at the outset about the nature of that experience and its limitations. I am a staff member of a private American foundation established initially for the "advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the peoples of the United States," but empowered by a supplementary gift of the founder to devote a portion of its annual income (about 7.5% of the total) to the same purposes in countries of the Commonwealth—not, however, including the United Kingdom, where Andrew Carnegie established a separate trust. I have for some time been director of this international dimension of Carnegie Corporation's activities.

While many of our grants have been made in direct support of developmental projects of Commonwealth universities, a considerable part of our income—and of staff effort—has, over the years, gone into planning and execution of co-operative schemes. Grants, for instance, to what is now the Association of Commonwealth Universities have helped to strengthen ties between the United Kingdom and overseas institutions. Grants to the Association of American Universities have brought it into informal relationship with the Commonwealth group. In addition, an extensive travel grant programme, which we have maintained for 40 years, has established a web of relationships among staffs of universities of the Southern Hemisphere Dominions and colleagues in the United States. From their first years we have had a particular interest in the development of the fledgling universities of the British colonial territories, and out of this grew a number of initiatives in the late 1950s and early 1960s designed to effect co-operation between the U.S. and Britain in assistance to university development—particularly in the newly independent countries of Africa.

The conferences held, mechanisms set up, all reflected our view, which we found shared in the United Kingdom, of the singular importance of understanding and co-operation between those who had been carrying the main responsibility for Commonwealth African universities, and those on our side who were suddenly rushing into the game sometimes bent on changing the rules—or at least shifting the goals. In all this we worked in close co-operation with the Inter-University Council for Higher Education Overseas in London and indeed helped to set up in Washington a group —now the Overseas Liaison Committee—to work with the Council and African institutions in bringing the resources of American higher education to bear on policy problems of university development. Perhaps the most concrete fruit of this period of co-operative ferment was the creation of the Ashby Commission of 1960 on Post-School Certificate and Higher Education in Nigeria. The report, representing the virtually unanimous views of three Americans, three Britons and three Nigerians, set the initial pattern for university development in that country.

Programmes of international co-operation have therefore been a significant part of my Foundation's activity—though necessarily in a relatively restricted segment of the world. In recent years we have

narrowed the focus of our attention to the field of education, more particularly to programmes and projects of universities in Commonwealth Africa—and to some extent in the Caribbean and the South Pacific as well—relating to teacher training, curriculum development and educational research. The aim has been to strengthen the capacity of institutes and departments of education to contribute to improvement and reform in primary and secondary education in their countries.

Although most of our grants in this programme have supported projects of individual universities, we have not overlooked the values of inter-institutional and international co-operation, for at the same time we have been supporting a network of African university institutes and departments of education through which all have been brought into close association with each other and with Teachers College, Columbia University, and the University of London Institute of Education as well.

I want to refer to this network more fully in a moment, as I want to use it to illustrate the points I would like to make about guidelines for establishing successful co-operative arrangements. From what I have said so far about my own experience, you will understand if my comments relate mainly to arrangements between developed and developing institutions, or among the latter. You will understand too that I see the opportunities and problems from the somewhat limited and special viewpoint of a foundation officer.

Foundations can play a useful rôle not only in providing the financial means for such arrangements, but as a third party to negotiations. Theirs is, however, a catalytic rôle and it is important that it remain so. Of course, if a foundation does not share the vision of certain would-be co-operators, as not infrequently happens, it may be viewed as a stumbling block to progress. But we must live with that.

The network I have mentioned is the Association for Teacher Education in Africa. It was created in 1960 with the help of a Carnegie Corporation grant on the initiative of three educators, one American, and an Englishman and a New Zealander, both of whom had had extensive experience in West Africa. Known originally, and for its first 9 years, as the Afro-Anglo-American Programme in Teacher Education, it involved initially institutes of education in six African universities, the Institute at London, and Teachers College, where the administrative headquarters was. In 1969 the centre of gravity and leadership shifted to Africa. The Association maintains offices in Nairobi and Lagos. It comprises 33 institutes and departments of education in 18 universities of 12 countries. Over the years this Programme has involved not only annual conferences but staff exchanges, joint research undertakings, special fellowship opportunities, sponsorship of workshops on special topics. It has created a degree of co-operation, communication and common thinking that I believe is unmatched in any field in Africa.

Now how did this get started? No planning agency said, "We think it would be a good idea if institutes of education in Africa worked together and related to a British and an American university." No. The idea was formulated by particular individuals who were well acquainted with each other and had a keen sense of the need for such an initiative. To be sure the foundation played a crucial rôle. But it was in response to a well-formulated idea that had grown out of individual relationships

So I come to my first guideline for establishment of a successful co-operative project: *that it have the personal interest of key individuals.* I

don't know how many times we have been asked to support professional exchange schemes which were no more than statements on paper indicating that an institution would like to do such and such for so many years. But only when there are really committed persons at each end is a successful scheme likely to work out. This point emphasizes the importance of travel programmes, for it is through individual visiting experience abroad than an organic basis for successful co-operative programmes can be laid. This holds also for research and training schemes, as we have learned from bi-lateral programmes we have supported such as one in the field of child development involving Harvard University and the University of Nairobi. The interest and commitment of the key individuals at each end were crucial in the initiation of this project.

The success of any scheme, of course, depends to a considerable degree on favourable circumstances. But as a foundation officer has said, "One should always bet on the horses, not the condition of the track." The prime importance of the individual, his "track record" and his personal relationships are often overlooked. The planning of many projects might better have waited on the involvement of committed and qualified people and a complete meeting of minds.

A second consideration, then, is *that there should be adequate planning and financial support.* Here the rôles of international agencies, governments and foundations may be essential in bringing the parties together and ultimately providing the necessary support. In our view, planning by the participants themselves is essential though we are not above taking steps to see that it is carefully done and that the results will be of a nature that we can support. Again, in the case of what became the Association for Teacher Education in Africa (ATEA) we funded a special conference of all the individuals whose institutes were involved before any commitment was made to launch a programme. When it was launched, it was given a three-year grant renewable for a further period. We have supported it now for 15 years and shall probably do so a little longer before the inevitable moment comes when it must be on its own.

A third point is *that co-operative programmes must have a well-defined purpose and manageable scope.* In the 1960s some American universities proposed broad institutional commitment projects of universitiy development in new countries. Under contract with the Agency for International Development, Michigan State University, which had a dean of international activities, had a campus-wide involvement with the University of Nigeria, Nsukka. This kind of overall commitment has its problems and is going out of fashion. I am inclined to agree with those who believe that links established at the school or departmental level have the best chance of productive life. Given leadership and continuing interest of key individuals, adequate planning and finance, co-operative projects in staff development, teaching or research will be most effective if the objective is clear and the operation is limited in scope to particular departments or professional fields.

Again, ATEA had a clear focus on the strengthening of teacher education in English-speaking Africa and linked departments and institutes of education with each other and with units of two institutions abroad having similar objectives. All those involved in this network of relationships were leading professional educators in their countries. The organization has tended to heighten their sense of common purpose and has greatly facilitated the communication of new ideas.

My fourth criterion for judging the viability of an inter-university project is *that there be benefit to both institutions*, or mutual benefit to all concerned. The latter has certainly been true in ATEA. In the case of the developed and developing institution, the benefits will be of differing kinds and perhaps unequal; but they must be there. The Faculty of Education of Makerere in Uganda has benefited tremendously from its association with Teachers College through ATEA and other programmes. Its contribution to national development in a priority field has been enhanced. Teachers College, on the other hand, through the experience gained by its faculty members in Africa and through a continuing flow of African graduate students, has become the leading centre on African education in the United States.

In the case of research there is the problem that the visiting scholar in a developing country may be too intent on *his* purposes to the detriment of the overall goals of the programme. There is always an element of tension inherent in programmes involving researchers from abroad. A well managed one, however, will keep it creative.

There is one area in which the rôles of developed and developing universities could well be reversed. That is the area of indigenous cultural studies. Universities in Africa and the West Indies, for instance, have made good beginnings in programmes on local history and culture. But art, music, theatre and the dance are still rather unfamiliar territory to institutions founded in the European tradition. In some instances more is being done in these fields by universities abroad than at home—and often by indigenous scholars. Aid agencies are understandably preoccupied with the economic and educational priorities for national development. We should note in discussing co-operative projects that the most distinctive contributions of the new universities may lie in their interpretations of the cultures they represent.

Now I should like to say a word about student exchange—or rather schemes for study abroad. Co-operation among universities may be an important factor at the sending or at the receiving end, or indeed in organizing both. One striking example of co-operation at the receiving end to meet a particular problem was the organization in 1961 of the African Scholarship Programme of American Universities, known as ASPAU. In the late 1950s hundreds of African students were coming to the United States, many by air lift from East Africa on a somewhat opportunistic basis, poorly selected, inadequately financed, haphazardly placed, and in the main unsponsored. The establishment of ASPAU, which ultimately involved a consortium of 234 colleges and universities, solved each of these problems at one stroke. Financed by our Agency for International Development (AID) and foundations, its administrative arrangements were handled by the African-American Institute and—included selection committees in each sending country. From 1960 to 1970 more than 1300 students completed undergraduate courses under this programme.

The programme has now been discontinued and replaced by one for postgraduate study, for clearly with the rapid development of Africa's own universities the priority must now be at that level. The Association of African Universities, however, continues to run a programme which grew out of the ASPAU experience—the Inter-African Universities Scholarships Programme (INTERAF) which assists African undergraduate students to study in other African countries subjects not offered in their own. ASPAU illustrates again the importance of some of the conditions

I have mentioned. It was in a real sense the creation of two particular individuals: one Nigerian and one American. It had the advantage of a year's planning by means of a pilot project for one country. The financing was adequate and included assistance from the American universities, and, most important, travel support from the governments of the sending countries. The programme met a specific need at the right time.

Throughout the life of the ASPAU programme the question of relevance of an individual's study to his country's needs was constantly discussed. Indeed there was a running battle between our aid agency and the ASPAU organization over the issue of training vs. education. AID was under pressure to show that the programme was serving priority needs of national development, while the universities placed individual development first and tended to encourage students wishing to shift from, say, engineering or physics to sociology or the humanities. I myself have a good deal of sympathy for this kind of freedom for undergraduates. Who can be sure what may be the best preparation for a future civil servant or political leader?

At the graduate and professional level, however, the position is different. Relevance is essential, and where staff development is involved, it is very important that there be close co-ordination between the sending and receiving institutions. At a recent conference on international development at the University of Massachusetts a speaker gave a classic illustration of the way advanced education can misfire. He had met in Liberia a man who had studied geology in the United States and became the first Ph.D. in this field in his country. Geologists are generally divided between those concerned with soft, or sedimentary rocks and those concerned with hard rocks. This man had spent eight years specializing in soft rock geology. Yet, as the speaker pointed out, "There has not been a soft rock in Liberia in 3.5 million years!" The man has become an office manager.

One aspect of the now familiar ATEA programme will illustrate what I believe is an ideal approach to advanced study. In connection with the programme a limited number of graduate fellowships are offered at Teachers College, Columbia University, one of the member institutions. The African member institutions of ATEA make nominations for these awards from among bright younger staff members in their institutes or departments of education. Final selection is made by Teachers College. As most of the nominees these days already have master degrees, the fellowships normally cover two calendar years of advanced work in various specialties in education leading to the doctorate. The funds supplied by my foundation include provision for return to Africa during the course of the fellowship for field work relating to the doctoral dissertation. The sending institutions provide the fares and normally have a place waiting for the student on his return. Another valuable feature of the programme is that the students engage as a group with faculty in certain intellectual and social activities. All the interlocking features of this particular programme have resulted in a 90 percent rate of return and in many promotions to more responsible and influential positions. Because the programme has been sustained in operation over a period of 15 years, the cumulative effect has been substantial.

I have concerned myself mainly with what one looks for at the outset. In any overall appraisal of an on-going programme, surely one of the questions to be asked is, "Has it had a cumulative effect?" Others

may be, "Has it led to significant changes in teaching or in the outlooks of the participants?" "Have elements of it been incorporated in the mainstream of activities of the institutions concerned?" "Has it led to establishment of other co-operative ventures?"

These are not easy to answer, but I submit that favourable answers in any given case will depend heavily on the soundness of the original conception and the degree of motivation and sense of common purpose which creative individuals bring to the enterprise.

Discussion

Mr. Griffiths thanked Mr. Stackpole and said that the two papers given that morning complemented one another admirably, and although they had been based on such very different experiences, their authors had reached very similar conclusions.

First of all, it was clear that very many organizations were concerned with co-operation at different levels. But this did not mean that effort was scattered and wasted; it organized and systematized itself into a complex network which, taken as a whole, constituted a valuable instrument for articulating and differentiating various types of co-operation.

Second, this wide-ranging institutional provision did not detract from the key rôle played by individuals in devising, organizing and carrying out programmes of co-operation. Certainly, individuals could not do everything and they needed to be able to rely on effective supporting bodies, but their rôle of inspiration and animation remained decisive.

Finally, the importance of reciprocity had very rightly been underlined time and again; it was the touchstone of co-operation. But co-operation really only served its true purpose if it was of mutual benefit to the individuals directly concerned, to their universities and to the societies they served. Perhaps it would be necessary to try to convince governments of the benefits for the national community which could accrue from permanent links between their universities and those in other countries. For these links were less subject to the hazards and ruptures than those of a purely political or economic kind, and they provided a much sounder basis for contact and international comprehension.

Dr. LULE, while agreeing that individuals could play a very important rôle, pointed out that they came and went. It was consequently hazardous to allow co-operation to centre exclusively on particular individuals. Institutions must also be involved. The condition of the track was also very important, to take up Mr. Stackpole's image. In the case of the programme to train teachers for Africa, to which he had referred, it could indeed be said that the ground had been well prepared and the interested institutions and governments as well as individuals had given their full support.

Mr. STACKPOLE recognized that the preparation of the ground was very important. But this was also something with which individuals were concerned. Without their really committed participation, a good programme could not be brought into being. The individual was the most important element.

Sir Hugh SPRINGER also felt that the human element was the most important even if, quite clearly, it was not the only one. This was not to deny the need for resources, good management and organization. But a man with determination could get the better of difficult conditions, whereas the best planned programme would fail it it were not entrusted to the right man.

Individuals and personal contacts, moreover, were important at all levels: the collection of information, the selection of scholarship-holders, the recruitment of teachers, etc.

The quality and competence of individuals were therefore among the decisive criteria for success. In this connection, it would doubtless be more profitable to examine the criteria which could be of help in forecasting the success of programmes than to study those which were of use in making *a posteriori* judgments which were, after all, of very limited value.

Mr. GRIFFITHS, Chairman of the session, said that the value of an individual depended not only on his academic qualifications, but also on his personality, tact, ability to adapt to the ways of foreign countries and instinctive avoidance at times of saying or doing something which he would feel at perfect liberty to say or do at home.

Dr. CUEVAS DEL CID stressed that it was not possible to evaluate co-operation without agreement on its objectives. It was not tolerable for a foreign organization to impose its choice of aims and fields of work, as had happened in some Latin American countries. This remark was perhaps brutal, but real co-operation could only be based on complete truthfulness.

Mr. GRIFFITHS said he was sure that the participants would appreciate the frankness with which Dr. Cuevas del Cid had spoken.

Dr. GOMA drew attention to certain, sometimes neglected, qualities that ought to be found in individuals engaged in co-operation. It should not be forgotten that in many countries of the third world, universities were not merely academic institutions; their functions also involved various forms of participation in national and public life. In Zambia, for example, the University played an important consultative rôle in national planning and even helped to carry out certain plans. Those engaged in co-operation should be able to adapt themselves to such situations and have an understanding of national objectives. In practice, however, they often seemed to play a secondary and quite marginal rôle. This was particularly so when programmes were carried out under inter-governmental cultural agreements. In the flush of their enthusiasm for co-operation, governments sometimes did not pay sufficient attention to the choice of the individuals who were to put the programmes into operation and who, finding themselves "parachuted" into a country, did not always feel a sense of involvement in its aspirations and development efforts.

Dr. SAITO said that Japan was particularly lacking in men able to give leadership in international co-operation, although there was now a strong feeling in favour of co-operation. Funds were available, although not on an overgenerous scale, and a foundation, the Japan Foundation,

had been set up to promote co-operation. But the men were lacking, partly because of the linguistic barrier which was very serious for Japan, and partly because university people, who nevertheless liked making study and research trips abroad, hesitated to accept responsibility for the organization and operation of programmes. It would be interesting to know how other countries trained people for this rôle.

Mr. GRIFFITHS said that this was indeed a very difficult problem to which he saw no ready-made solution.

Dr. KIRPAL pointed out that it was difficult to make an overall appraisal of co-operation; any general evaluation should at least be preceded by the evaluation of a series of particular projects. For this it was possible to measure certain elements such as time and money spent, but others were not quantifiable. Devotion and commitment, for example, were of decisive importance but they could not be measured. Emphasis had very rightly been placed on the importance of the individual engaged in co-operation. But by definition such individuals did not work in isolation, and the results of the complex interactions between them were sometimes quite unexpected, above all because it was difficult to predict the effects that work in a particular political climate and cultural environment would have on individuals and groups.

A difficulty of another kind arose because international university co-operation was not always the only means of achieving a given purpose. In some cases, increased national effort or direct recourse to an aid-giving body could provide alternative means of action. The relative effectiveness of university co-operation thus had to be compared with that of other methods, and it was very difficult to do this.

If evaluations were made, the results should be published, especially those of successful programmes, so that they could serve as examples.

Professor DISCHAMPS stressed that questions of evaluation were of particular importance for a country such as France which made a large contribution to co-operation in the field of education. In relation to the size of its population it occupied a leading position. In 1974, 52,000 foreign students were studying in France, whilst in 1972, there were exactly 32,081 French teachers serving abroad, including about 4,000 at the university level. This obviously involved considerable expenditure and it was therefore of special importance to evaluate the extent to which programmes achieved their purposes. But the area was one in which it was most difficult to make cost-benefit analyses. Expenditure should be regarded as including not only direct costs but also indirect costs, such as loss of earnings resulting from the fact that, whilst engaged in co-operation, an individual could not carry out other duties or productive work. A major and possibly insurmountable difficulty was also encountered in seeking to evaluate benefits. This, as had already been mentioned, was the need to incorporate both quantifiable and non-quantifiable elements, and to find some means of adding them together. Though this might seem like trying to square the circle, every effort should be made to try to rationalize policies in matters of co-operation.

Such policies should consist of a well-articulated series of choices made on the basis of a systematically established order of priorities. For example, a country which made available a large number of scholarships

had to decide how to distribute them between different geographical and linguistic regions, between different subjects and disciplines and between different levels of study. The situation with regard to the latter was now clearer than it was several years ago. The development of new universities in developing countries was making possible the progressive elimination of study abroad at the undergraduate level and, with the exception of some very specialized fields, those studying abroad in future would be postgraduate and doctoral students.

Students who did not benefit from scholarships and who paid for their studies themselves presented a different problem. It might seem reasonable to let them make their own evaluation of the benefit derived from their investment. This, however, would only be a rough measure. In France, at least, they were usually less successful than scholarship-holders, for the obvious reason that they had not been selected with the same care and their linguistic ability had not been tested thoroughly enough. Linguistic ability played a major rôle in success or failure, but its importance varied from one discipline to another. Ideally, special provision should be made not only for each ethnic group, but also for each discipline.

The formulation of rational policies based on coherent criteria in all these areas and their subsequent application through appropriate institutions constituted a complex task. It was part of the institutionalization of co-operation referred to by Professor Gligorijević but in the final analysis its success would depend on the talent and motivation of those in charge, as Mr. Stackpole had stressed.

Dr. RIBBING observed that the criteria for evaluation necessarily differed from one type of programme to another. In general, however, they must be multi-dimensional and be concerned not only with the internal success of a programme, but also with its external success in terms of society as a whole, for the two were by no means necessarily concomitant.

The multiplicity of factors which should be taken into account made it necessary to start by making a detailed analysis of them. Time spent on the careful preparation of programmes was more than recouped when they were put into operation. The design of efficient mechanisms, including those for evaluation, also called for great care, even if individuals were of decisive importance for the success of co-operation.

Finally, special attention should be paid to the cumulative or multiplying effects of certain programmes.

Dr. MILLER recalled that the next IAU General Conference would take place in Moscow in August 1975 and participants might therefore be interested to hear something of the way in which inter-university co-operation was conceived and organized in the Soviet Union between the different Republics as well as between the Soviet Union and other countries.

A few general comments about the Soviet system of higher education would permit a better understanding of the situation. First of all, the system was a vast one, embracing some 880 institutions and approximately 5,000,000 students. Its democratic character and the fact that it was free and accessible to all sections of the population were well known. What was perhaps less evident to those abroad was its multi-national character. The Soviet Union included about one hundred different nationalities and approximately 60% of all institutions of higher education provided

education in a national language as well as in Russian. This was in keeping with the democratic character of the system, but it was not without its problems.

The universities played an important and growing rôle in the educational system—and indeed in the life of Soviet society. There were now sixty universities with 700,000 students, though before the Great October Revolution there had been only eleven. After the Revolution, the first concern of the Government had been to strengthen and expand higher education, and of nearly fifty universities which had since been set up, forty were in the national republics. There were universities in each of the fifteen Union republics and sixteen in the twenty autonomous republics.

The history of their development was most interesting and illustrated the constant preoccupation of the government with higher education and with the efficiency of university co-operation within the Union. The young universities owed much to the help they had received from older institutions—notably the Universities of Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev and Kazan. As early as 1922, on the initiative of Lenin, it was decided to set up the first university in Central Asia, in Tashkent. A large group of teachers went from Moscow and Leningrad to help organize it and their universities also provided substantial aid in the form of equipment and books. This process was subsequently repeated in the Caucasian republics and elsewhere. The links established at that time were still maintained. They had rapidly helped to cure the inevitable growing pains of the young universities and quickly enable them to achieve high standards in the education they provided. The thousands of very competent specialists they had trained satisfied the manpower needs of the Union and autonomous republics and also provided them with their own creative intelligentsia. Forty of the sixty universities provided courses in a national language as well as in Russian, and sometimes in more than one. This was the case in Daghestan, which had some thirty ethnic groups. In this way the policy of the Party and of the Government responded to the aspirations of the Soviet people, who, far from being subject to cultural colonialism, were encouraged to cultivate their particular national resources.

Co-operation between universities within the Union had always been based on equality and mutual respect, but it had only gradually taken on the wide variety of forms it had now.

First, there were bilateral links between individual universities. These were usually set up under agreements of friendship and collaboration. Second, and of quite recent origin, there were multilateral groups, usually set up on a regional basis. An interesting example was the Scientific Centre established in the Northern Caucasus with the co-operation of universities and other institutions of higher education. It enabled the various institutions to co-ordinate their scientific activities and to carry out some of them jointly.

Third, it had long been the practice of the older universities to assume the responsibility of training young teachers and research workers for the younger universities in the Republics. More recently, this form of assistance had been extended to the specialized training and retraining of scientific and educational manpower. The practice of inviting guest professors from other universities was also very widespread.

Finally, at the all-Union level, a Council of Rectors had recently been set up by order of the Ministry of Higher Education and entrusted with tasks of co-ordinating university activities.

Turning from the Union to the Republics, Latvia might serve as an example. The Latvian Republic was relatively small, with a population of only 2,500,000, but it had a very rich and ancient cultural tradition which it had preserved with its national language through all the vicissitudes of its history. Since its attachment to the Soviet Union, 34 years ago, there had been a considerable development of the economy and of education, in particular, of higher education. The number of institutions of higher education had risen from four to ten and the number of students, from 10,000 to 45,000.

The University had been founded in 1919, at the time when Latvia was first proclaimed a sovereign Soviet Republic—though it existed only till the beginning of 1920. It had a wide range of contacts which naturally included specially close relations with the universities of Tartu and Vilnius in the neighbouring Baltic Republics to which it was linked by agreements of friendship and co-operation.

Co-operation took both traditional forms (exchanges of teachers, books, etc.) and more innovatory forms. In co-operation with Belorussia, the three Baltic Republics held annual scientific conferences of students and of teachers. They also organized university sports meetings and choral festivals which were very popular in the Baltic countries.

Apart from maintaining these links, Soviet universities also co-operated with universities in other countries. Dr. Kirpal had commented generously on Soviet co-operation with Indian universities. In fact, almost all Soviet universities had partners abroad, most frequently, of course, in countries with which the Soviet Union traditionally had links of friendship. P. Stuchka Latvian State University, for example, had agreements linking it with the University of Rostock and the Charles University in Prague. It held meetings with each of them every two years to decide on biennial programmes of co-operation: exchanges of students, books and trainees, organization of scientific conferences, etc.

It might be helpful to add that the best way of obtaining information about Soviet University co-operation was through the Ministry of Higher Education which had an information centre. The journal *Vestnik Vyssei Školy* could also be consulted. Possibly IAU could try to publish more information about Soviet higher education.

Dr. LULE asked whether the use of several languages in higher education did not pose a double problem: first, that of textbooks, and second, that of communication with universities in the other republics and foreign countries.

Dr. MILLER agreed that there were problems with textbooks, but they were not insurmountable in the framework of the Soviet Union. If the demand for textbooks in a national language was too small to justify publication, Russian-language textbooks were used. Russian constituted a second mother tongue for the great majority of Soviet citizens and all students knew it well. Though not the first official language in the non-Russian Republics it was the language of communication for the whole Union.

Dr. KIRPAL said that he had been able to visit experimental schools in Moscow and Leningrad, where all teaching was given in a foreign language

—including one in which Hindi was used—and asked whether similar experiments had been carried out at the university level. He also asked about the rôle of the Academy of Sciences in matters of co-operation, since it often appeared to be involved in programmes concerning centres of advanced study in India.

Dr. MILLER replied that there were indeed schools which used a foreign language as the medium of instruction—English, German or French in Latvia. Despite the former predominance of German, English now attracted by far the largest number of pupils. Historically, French had a quite strong influence, but was now chosen only by a small percentage of pupils. At the university level, language teaching was the responsibility of the faculty of foreign languages, which included three departments: English (the largest), German and French.

There was close co-operation between the universities and the Academy of Sciences, and efforts were being made to strengthen it further. The universities trained scientific manpower for the Academy which, for its part, placed its training and research facilities of certain of its institutes at the disposal of the universities.

Dr. GOMA, speaking of evaluation, said that, surprisingly enough, there was a tendency to overlook one group which was of special importance when it came to measuring the effect of programmes: the students themselves. As a general rule a period of study abroad was regarded as a success if the student passed his examinations. Too little attention was paid to the effect his presence had had on colleagues in the host country (and this was an important aspect of "reciprocity") and to follow-up once he had returned to his own country. Could he make use of what he had learned, did he experience difficulties of readaptation? Too often, such students were not heard of again, once they had boarded the plane for home. An attempt should be made to establish more permanent links with them and to know something of how their lives developed. Examination marks and results were not sufficient in themselves.

Mr. HOLLAND believed that the presence of foreign students in United States universities had had a profound influence on American students and that this was a very important aspect of co-operation. It was true, however, that there was a tendency to concentrate attention on the foreign students. In the United States, sociologists and anthropologists had made a series of detailed surveys of different groups of students: Africans, Indians, Mexicans, Japanese, Swedes, Belgians, etc. These had proved most instructive for those administering the programmes. Despite the problems encountered by foreign students and the frustrations to which they were sometimes subject, the results were generally positive. As Dr. Dischamps had said, they were better in the case of the scholarship holders, who had been selected with much greater care than the others.

Sir Hugh SPRINGER felt that there was little point in trying to define and apply criteria for evaluation which were over-technical and over-scientific. Too many imponderables were involved, and judgments of qualitative factors were inevitably subjective. Co-operation was mainly a matter of meetings, publications and exchanges of persons. Meetings were expected to be stimulating and, if possible, instructive; publications

to be accurate and up-to-date; exchanges to involve well-selected persons and to be provided with adequate financial support and a flexible organization, permitting rapid and efficient communication. It was doubtful whether a whole armoury of "scientific" criteria was needed for their evaluation.

To take an example, an attempt had been made recently to gauge the success of the Commonwealth Scholarship Programme by asking the interested governments and the scholarship-holders themselves what they thought of the programme. In practical terms, it was difficult to imagine more sophisticated methods could have led to a better appraisal.

With regard to the scholarship programmes, the Inter-African Scholarship Programme, set up by the Association of African Universities, constituted a particularly interesting experiment in the exchange of persons between countries of the third world. Twenty-five years ago, when there was still only an embryo of university life in Africa, it was natural that the principal movements of persons should take place in the direction of the industrialized countries. Since then the situation had changed considerably and it was becoming increasingly clear that, despite their diversity, the countries of the third world had a number of problems in common which they could not hope to resolve simply by copying the rich countries. In many technical fields, for example, they had to invent new technologies, less complex and expensive and better adapted to their rhythm of production. Recognizing the importance of these new trends, the ACU and the Commonwealth Secretariat had recently launched a programme to facilitate systematic contacts and exchanges between developing countries in different parts of the Commonwealth.

The Chairman then closed the discussion.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

General Discussion

Mgr Leclercq took the chair and opened the session recalling that the morning had been reserved for a general debate during which discussion could be continued on matters which had already been considered, if this was felt necessary, and during which other questions related to co-operation could also be raised.

Professor DISCHAMPS noted that although student exchanges were perhaps the most important aspect of co-operation, the ground for them should be prepared in advance by exchanges of academic staff. But whether students or teachers were involved, a special problem arose if it was decided to send them to a university which gave instruction in a language without wide international usage or which even had a purely local character. However enriching the experience of learning such a language might be, it was unlikely to appear "profitable"—to use a rather ugly word—to those concerned. Consequently, some universities were likely to remain untouched by the main currents of co-operation. Did this problem arise in the case of the Latvian University, and if so, how was it resolved?

Dr. MILLER replied that there was no real problem. The University gave instruction in Latvian for the Latvians, but a large number of Russians and of people of other nationalities lived in the republic, and for them, instruction was given exclusively in Russian. There were therefore two language groups in the University and foreigners could, if they wished, join the Russian group.

Dr. RIBBING recalled Sir Hugh Springer's comment that the criteria for the evaluation of co-operation should not be over-technical or too complex. This might apply in relation to the exchange of persons, but there were other kinds of co-operation. For example, a university in an industrialized country might collaborate with another in the third world to set up a new institution—perhaps an institute for nutrition. It was obvious that the problems they would encounter would not only be scientific and educational, but also psychological, sociological and economic. In such situations multi-dimensional evaluation was needed and this could be most complicated. Each form of co-operation should therefore embody its own criteria and a mechanism for permanent self-evaluation should be included in each programme.

Sir Hugh Springer had also referred to the evaluation of meetings which was by no means a simple matter. A meeting was both a psychological experience and an operational mechanism, which contributed to

a greater or lesser extent to the achievement of objectives which had been more or less well selected and defined. Very little was at present known about what determined the success or failure of a meeting and this was a field in which research would be useful.

M. VULOVIĆ described the inter-university co-operation carried out by the League of Yugoslav Universities and with its assistance. Before the creation of the League at Skopje in 1957, co-operation between the Yugoslav universities had not been structured. It had taken place through contacts between teachers and students, and, through conferences and interfaculty bodies which, incidentally, still existed. Inter-university conferences were first held in 1954 and the need for a permanent body quickly became evident. It was thus that the League had been set up.

The League carried out a wide variety of tasks. It studied problems of common interest to all Yugoslav universities; organized co-operation and the co-ordination of their activities on a permanent basis; drew up recommendations for university policy and followed up their applications; collected and published information; stimulated the holding of interfaculty meetings; submitted proposals to the federal authorities and to the authorities of the Republics; and collaborated with international organizations.

Its organs were the Plenary Assembly, the Praesidium and a series of commissions, committees and *ad hoc* groups. The Praesidium had important functions, and, apart from providing general leadership it formulated on its own authority opinions and proposals on many problems. The Commissions, which brought together leading experts and students, played an important rôle in preparing decisions.

Students were represented on all the bodies of the League, and their participation varied from 30% to 50% in some cases. The unions of scientific workers were also represented.

One of the fundamental principles of the League was that within it the Yugoslav universities all enjoyed absolute equality regardless of their age or size. The presidency was taken by each university in turn and the place of meeting rotated in the same way. Each university had now also been entrusted with the main responsibility for at least one commission. The system set up was thus both coherent and decentralized.

Mr. Keyes had mentioned in flattering terms the international seminar "The University Today" which the League organized annually in Dubrovnik. It could indeed be said that during the 18 years of its existence, the Seminar had come to be recognized throughout the world as an important university forum. In all, 3,500 eminent scholars and students from 100 countries had been able to participate and discuss, in an atmosphere of openness and great friendliness, some of the problems raised for universities and societies by the development of knowledge. Participants in the present meeting were cordially invited to attend the Dubrovnik Seminar in the coming summer to see for themselves.

The League also published a journal "The University Today" which opened its columns to university people both Yugoslav and foreign and which also sought to encourage discussion of major questions of university policy. As a result of efforts of this kind it was no longer altogether true to say the "the university studies everything but itself."

Finally, the League played an important rôle in bilateral and multilateral relationships between its members and universities in other countries. At present about 35,000 foreign students, mostly from Africa, Asia, and

Latin America, were studying in Yugoslavia. Most of them had come on their own initiative. Some were following postgraduate or highly specialized courses. In addition, each Yugoslav university was now linked by an agreement with at least one university in another Socialist country and a growing number of them also had agreements with West European universities. Most co-operation took place on the basis of agreements between governments but it could also be initiated as a result of mutual visits by delegations of heads of universities. As from the autumn of 1974, the new International University Institute in Dubrovnik would provide a programme of postgraduate studies in the human sciences. Forty countries were associated with the Institute. There were in fact many forms of co-operation and the task of the League was to define general policy in matters of co-operation for Yugoslavia. It also had excellent relations with international organizations such as Unesco, IAU, CRE and IAUPL as well as with a number of national bodies and ministries.

In conclusion, it might be claimed that the League was an organization of considerable significance since it worked in the interest of some 200,000 persons—teachers, students and workers in the universities. It had shown itself to be a creative force in Yugoslav university life, and had been of great help in opening it up to society at large, nationally and internationally.

Mgr. LECLERCQ, Chairman of the session, said that the experience of the League of Yugoslav Universities was most interesting and could serve as an example to be followed.

Mr. KEYES recalled the circumstances in which the Dubrovnik Seminar had been created, soon after the end of the Second World War and during the period of the cold war, in a devastated Europe, intellectually weakened and divided by hatred. At that time it had needed great courage and generosity to organize meetings between people on different sides of the dividing lines. However, that was exactly what the Yugoslav universities had done. Universities throughout Europe had contributed in no small way to the creation of a new spirit and to the remaking of the fabric of intellectual life, but the Yugoslav universities had played a special rôle. Later, and a step ahead of contemporary trends, they had directed their attention to the problems of the third world and had opened the Seminar to university men and women from developing countries.

The Seminar had thus found new sources of vitality, and there was every reason to believe that it would continue to do so. Part of its success could certainly be explained by the spirit of openness which its organizers had been able to foster. It had never been used as an instrument for indoctrination or political propaganda.

Mr. HOLLAND asked for a more detailed explanation of the significance of student participation in the decision-making bodies of the League and of the universities themselves.

Mr. VULOVIĆ replied that students participated in all the bodies of the League, normally in a proportion of 30%, and added that this participation, far from being purely formal, was very real. The students often had most stimulating ideas and they defended their positions tenaciously.

Professor HUMO confirmed that student participation was also very effective in the universities themselves. One of its most interesting aspects concerned the organization and evaluation of the teaching process. Students were represented on the committees responsible for this and they took part actively in the analysis and reform of courses of study. They were doubtless the best judges in these matters. Every year, after examinations had been held, they participated in the evaluation of the work accomplished during the year. They were concerned with textbooks, which constituted an important problem in Yugoslavia, because there were still shortages in some subjects. They also played an important part in the organization of postgraduate studies and in the day-to-day research carried out in the universities.

The entire responsibility for the allocation of loans and scholarships rested with student bodies and they were also in full charge of the management of student residences, the organization of leisure activities, etc. Their rôle within the university was thus of great significance and to talk about it was not to move away from the field of co-operation, for it represented a particularly interesting example of co-operation between students and teachers.

Professor DISCHAMPS recalled that Yugoslavia, a socialist country, was trying to combine planning and self-management and asked what effects this had on students' choice of discipline. This was a major problem, as it was particularly difficult to reconcile the demands of planning with those of freedom of choice, to which the universities were very much attached. It had not been solved in France, and at the end of the first year of study, some 40% of students who had chosen badly left the university. Such wastage was difficult to tolerate.

M. VULOVIĆ said that planning for general and specialized manpower needs had been decentralized and was now the responsibility of each Republic. It was at this level that the needs for specialists were determined and that professional profiles were drawn up. Studies of the situation were, however, also being made at the federal level.

There was complete freedom in the choice of field of study or professional activity, except in faculties where a *numerus clausus* applied. At the University of Skopje, there were no restrictions. This freedom did give rise to some problems for, despite the efforts made, counselling services were still inadequate. In Yugoslavia also, a certain selection had to be made at the end of the first year.

Professor GLIGORIJEVIĆ added that in Yugoslavia planning was planning by consent, and the final plan could be described as the meeting point of several different plans. The federal plan constituted only a general framework, and was itself drawn up on the basis of regional plans.

Although the planning process had reached an advanced stage in Yugoslavia, higher education still posed special problems, not all of which had been resolved. Because the Republics had not yet all reached the same level of development, there were discrepancies and disparities and these had repercussions on schooling and education in general. Some Republics were not yet able to train all the specialists they needed. According to Unesco statistics, only about 12% of successful secondary school leavers entered higher education in the poorer Republics, whereas in the more prosperous Republics the figure could be as high as 60%. It could

be said that the capacity of higher education of the country, as a whole, was quite large, since there were in all 300,000 students. But this capacity was unevenly distributed. Consequently there were movements of students from one region to another. This, of course, was a healthy phenomenon in itself. Of the 60,000 students enrolled in the University of Belgrade about 15,000 were non-Serbs. Macedonia, however, presented a special problem. It was relatively isolated for linguistic reasons and therefore had difficulty in attracting people from the other Republics.

M. BEUTLER, though he did not wish to give a systematic description of the activities of AUPELF, raised some points which arose from its experience, particularly with reference to reciprocity and criteria for evaluation.

As a broad generalization it might be said that universities had a twofold mission: to encompass and make known as much knowledge as possible at a given time, and to contribute to the development and fulfilment of their society, notably by training men and women able to serve it.

The purposes of co-operation could be deduced from these fundamental tasks. Two of them merited special attention. Co-operation should seek, on the one hand, to promote the establishment of centres of excellence wherever appropriate, since, as had been pointed out, they were by no means a monopoly of the West; and, on the other, it should encourage the development of universities, particularly the younger ones, which, in their turn, would contribute to the development of their country. As Mr. Griffiths had said, there was absolutely no reason to be ashamed of asking for money to help certain universities, since this in effect was simply a matter of the more equitable distribution of wealth.

At the same time, co-operation must satisfy the cardinal requirement of reciprocity. It might be possible, for instance, to organize a flow of students from the third world to the industrialized countries, and a flow of teachers in the opposite direction. But this was not how AUPELF saw its rôle. It did not, in any case, have the funds needed to operate student exchange programmes.

AUPELF sought, on the one hand, to contribute to the creation of more centres of excellence in Africa and Asia and, on the other, to contribute to the interpenetration of cultures. This had led it to set up "Chairs of Co-operation" to encourage a flow of teachers from Africa and the East to the West. Scholars from developing countries were thus able to come to industrialized countries as visiting professors in fields such as Mahgrebian sociology, modern African literature and tropical medicine. The chairs also provided a means of creating a much needed awareness of the values and achievements of other cultures among Western students. In the same context, AUPELF had organized a colloquium on "The University and Cultural Pluralism."

But how could an evaluation be made of the results of such activities or the real impact of the "chairs of co-operation" be measured? AUPELF was evolving a number of criteria for this but it had to be admitted that a complete typology of them had not yet been established. Some could be arithmetical in character, for example: audience size or the level of attendance at courses, or examination pass rates. Others could not be expressed numerically but were nonetheless instructive: the success of an action begun at a particular point in time could be gauged in terms of the ways in which it subsequently developed or by its multiplying effects.

For example, one "chair of co-operation" had led to the establishment of a joint Canadian-Tunisian interdisciplinary research team.

However, it had to be recognized that even the successes of co-operation were often little known and attracted little attention. In general there was little public awareness of such matters and university organizations were confronted with a problem of diffusing information. They often had the impression of working at a task for Sisyphus, their rock being the mass of documents which were regularly thrown into wastepaper baskets. The means of publicity available to co-operation were very small compared with those employed in the world of industry and commerce. The sight of advertisements and stickers throughout France advertising Elf petrol, sometimes tempted M. Beutler to wish that he could send out commandos to change them all overnight to read *AUPELF*.

Dr. SAITO emphasized that the main purpose of co-operation should be the diffusion of knowledge, and especially of mutual knowledge of countries and regions. Though Japan had always tried to learn *from* other countries, it had not been concerned to learn *about* them. It had sometimes tried to help foreign countries, but without knowing them, and this ignorance had provoked attitudes of rejection. Universities should, therefore, develop programmes of study concerned with the major geographical and cultural regions: Latin America, for example, or the Soviet Union. Such programmes should be reciprocal, with exchanges of staff and students.

Mgr. LECLERCQ, Chairman of the session, said that with this most interesting suggestion, the session must come to a close.

Dr. AMNUAY added that the Japanese "villain" who provoked attitudes of rejection generally came from the world of business and not from the university.

The session was then closed.

***

Sir Hugh Springer took the chair and invited Mr. Daillant to present the "aide-mémoire" which he had drafted with his colleagues. This would not constitute a report of the Seminar; it was simply an attempt to recall the main lines of the discussion. Mr. Daillant then read the following text.

Secretariat Aide-mémoire

These remarks, made on behalf of the IAU Secretariat cannot claim to be a summary of the wide-ranging discussions you have just concluded. It would be absurd to try to extract the essential "marrow" of what you have said, for the simple reason that it was all essential and the process of extraction could only result in loss. We can thus merely offer you a partial and temporary recapitulation—an "aide-mémoire" as we call it, in order to avoid the more pretentious word "report". A formal report will be prepared later—we hope it will be reasonably complete—but it

will require time and care, as one of the participants has emphasized, and will be submitted to you before publication.

It is extremely difficult to draw precise and unequivocal conclusions from this particular seminar. This is partly because it has itself been an act of co-operation, in which different ways of thinking (some pragmatic, some more attached to theoretical and philosophical enquiry) have come together and partly because it has been a survey of co-operation at a time when doubts about it are being raised on a scale that might almost seem to indicate a crisis. Nor can it be claimed that these doubts have been entirely removed during our few days of discussion. But substantial clarification has certainly been achieved.

Moreover, the purpose of IAU in organizing seminars of this kind is not to bring about the unanimous adoption of a series of recommendations at any price. It is to contribute to the progress of thinking on a given subject, through the confrontation of points of view drawn from different countries and regions of the world. This can have repercussions on future action, even if it does not produce simple recipes which claim to guarantee success.

The problem of the relationship between thought and action has, indeed, dominated a large part of your discussions. Since we have the good fortune to be meeting in Yugoslavia, and since one of the participants made a number of references to the complex relationships between superstructure and infrastructure, it may perhaps not be out of place to preface our observations by a quotation from Karl Marx. In his famous and often-quoted thesis on Feuerbach, he said "until now philosophers have only interpreted the world; our purpose is to change it". As a good dialectical thinker Marx later came to see that superstructures themselves affect the "base", and that interpretation of the processes of change could itself change. In our present circumstances, certainly, it seems dangerous to give a straightforward priority either to interpretation or to change.

In the course of the last twenty years, in any case, we seem to have thrown ourselves headlong into the pursuit of change without taking time to think about all its consequences. So far as co-operation is concerned, we appeared to be convinced not only that co-operation was on the side of the angels, as the Secretary-General put it, but that change itself was riding on their wings. We are now obliged to come down from these doubly angelic heights, and even to envisage a "demonology" of co-operation; that is to say, to identify and unmask those disguised demons who, without our knowledge (and this is what is so serious) may seek to divert and to distort what we do.

The spirit of pride and of domination is undoubtedly one of these demons. Perhaps one should simply say the phenomenon of domination, for forms of domination can exist even in the absence of what may properly be called a "spirit" of domination. When disparities between the resources available to different human groups become too great, the richer inevitably wield a weight and influence, and sometimes a fascination, going far beyond what is desired by any individual. This could well apply to a professor on mission in a foreign country; it would obviously be unfair to hold him personally responsible for such a situation.

This raises a matter on which all participants were in agreement, and which was repeated throughout the themes which you were asked to discuss. It may, therefore, be desirable to say a few words about it before speaking separately of the themes themselves. This general agreement

concerned *the primordial importance of mutual knowledge and understanding between partners in co-operation.* Almost everyone taking part insisted on this. In the example mentioned of a professor on mission abroad, it was stressed that he needs as much knowledge as possible, not only of the university which he is visiting, but also of the social and cultural reality of the country concerned. He must have respect for that country and have sensitivity and intuition enough to grasp its potential and its latent possibilities for independent development.

But it is also important—and this is sometimes forgotten—that his academic colleagues in the university which receives him should also know as much as possible about the society—often an industrialized one—from which he comes. They should be aware of the cultural model, the mental attitudes, everything that their colleague may bring with him unconsciously (because he has assimilated certain elements of his own society so thoroughly that he is not aware that they will not be accepted as a matter of course in other countries). Some misunderstandings could perhaps be avoided in this way.

It is true, for example, that extreme and even scandalous disparities exist in relationships between the so-called developed and developing countries, and that the dependence to which a number of references were made during the Seminar has had humiliating effects for the developing rather than for the developed countries. But it should not be believed that developed countries themselves live in a state of complete independence. They suffer from a more subtle and, one might say, more grotesque form of dependence—that of dependence on the machines they have created, and on the complex structures they have set up in modern technological societies. There is constant talk in the advanced countries of inevitable evolution and irreversible change. But this is only so because these changes are part of a system become so powerful that it has acquired its own independent life. "You can't stop progress"—this is the phrase used in France, often sardonically, to express this idea of inevitability. It seems true to say, therefore, that by creating dependence on them in other countries, the industrialized countries are in fact exporting their own forms of dependence. It is difficult for them to give other countries anything but what they themselves possess.

Although they ought to try, it is difficult for them to implant in the developing countries technologies which they themselves do not possess, medical knowledge and competence which they do not possess, management systems which they do not possess.

In the words of an old French saying, "even the prettiest girl in the world can only give what she has". Countries which are in need must, therefore, realize as clearly as they can the nature of the aid which is offered them. Such an awareness will not solve every problem, but it will help to avoid a good deal of the rancour, disappointment and frustration found in the developing world today.

Considerations such as these made a suggestion put forward by one of the participants seem particularly timely—namely that *one of the best contributions to co-operation would be for universities to promote special studies of the larger geographical and cultural areas.* This would encourage international organizations to continue their efforts in the field of information, at present usually more technical in character than those just mentioned, even if this might be a task for Sisyphus, as one of the participants put it. It may be true that some of this work will help to fill wastepaper

baskets—we are very aware of this problem in the IAU Secretariat—but we can reasonably hope that such documents will at least remain on office desks or even—why not?—be read by charladies. Few of them will find their place on bedside tables, but it remains important, as was said over and over again during the Seminar, for co-operation and the conditions for its success to be better known, and for a wider and wider public to be persuaded—not perhaps that co-operation has a tiger in its tank, for this might be wrongly interpreted—but that its Ark contains all the riches of the human, animal and natural species. This leads directly to the first theme of the Seminar—the purpose and significance of international university co-operation.

1. *Purpose and Significance of International University Co-operation*

In common with Noah's Ark, the university attempts to collect and save from the total disaster of oblivion, if not all the natural and cultural species, at least all that has been learned and all that men have said and thought about them throughout the ages and in all parts of the world. Obviously, no single university can alone reconstitute, preserve and add to knowledge. It must inevitably make extensive use of other work carried out in other universities, in other countries, in other epochs. A university is thus in essence an institution devoted to openness, to understanding, to co-operation. It was suggested during the Seminar that the significance of co-operation could be deduced from its own essence. It might perhaps be deduced from the essence of the university. One might well maintain that the essence of the university and the essence of co-operation are basically one and the same. But, for some participants, this question of the essence of co-operation was not likely to lead to fruitful results, and we will not dwell on it further. It was the existence rather than the essence of co-operation which interested them. Rather remarkably, however, this showed them to be Kantians. The *a priori* categories of our understanding—and of our cultures—make "being" (in this case the "being" of co-operation) unrecognizable to reason; in the last analysis we must have recourse to faith. And indeed, most of the participants affirmed a strong faith in co-operation, even those who seemed to think it more important to strengthen co-operation with all the resources of our practical reasoning than to grasp its philosophical essence.

The image of the Ark, however, is useful in stressing the importance of preserving all the diversity of the world. Co-operation in fact only makes sense in so far as this diversity continues. Consequently it can be said without hesitation, as one participant pointed out, that *one of the purposes of co-operation must be to help peoples and cultures to affirm their creative originality and thus escape from dependence.* The same participant stressed that the aims of co-operation were a prolongation of the aims of the university itself, so that a new conception of the university could give a new impulse to co-operation and put it more completely at the service of human dignity, of the search for more just ways of life and, therefore, of peace. In much the same way another participant insisted on the fundamentally democratic outlook which the university should represent. Co-operation should serve all mankind and foster the hopes of all workers.

No attempt can be made here to set out a precise statement of the purpose and significance of co-operation. You already have the two excellent papers which were presented on this subject during the Seminar. IAU *Paper* No. 9, of which you have copies, contains a number of precise

and carefully formulated definitions. But there was not time for you to make a new systematic analysis of purposes and sub-purposes with any of the rigour advocated by one of the participants. We will therefore move on to the question of reciprocity.

2. *Reciprocity*

The question of reciprocity does not lead us very far away from that of the significance of co-operation. As one of the speakers pointed out, to speak of reciprocal co-operation is a pleonasm. Without its essential prefix—the "with" which defines it—co-operation merely becomes "operation" and risks falling into the hands of those who are called in English "operators", that is to say intriguers. The same speaker also pointed out that reciprocity is not only a characteristic of inter-university co-operation, but also of the basic movement of the great civilizations throughout history, which were made up of currents of exchange moving sometimes in one direction, sometimes in another, and often interflowing. He recalled the saying of Valéry that civilizations are mortal. But they are mortal not only in the sense that they one day fall into decadence and disappear, but also in the sense that they die a little every day, like all living organisms. More easily than living organisms, however, they can absorb grafts and transplants. They die, but they can be transformed and renewed more easily. This phenomenon was emphasized with regard to languages but there are of course many other examples. *The important thing is that grafts should not be so large and so brutal that they kill off cells which cannot be renewed.* Here, too, there is a danger of thinking that only the societies of developing countries are threatened by cultural alienation and suffocation. The anthropologist Lévi-Strauss attracted great attention when he published a book entitled *The Sad Tropics*, because he could not endure the thought of so many cultures threatened with decline and extinction. But the cultures of countries in the temperate zones are also suffering from a sense of disequilibrium because of the ruptures they are undergoing, and particularly the alienation of human beings from their environment. Architecture was referred to during the Seminar as a symbol of harmony and a means of mediation between human beings and their natural surroundings. One has only to look at some of our modern cities to see what has happened to us, and Lévi-Strauss might well write a new book on the sadness of the West. As a number of speakers emphasized, we are all in the same boat, and even if there are different classes of passengers, the "West" is badly in need of lessons in wisdom and the joy of living from other cultures.

Inter-university co-operation could well be a privileged instrument for this exchange, provided that certain rejections and tensions can be avoided. Reciprocity does not require the exchange of like for like (which would in fact make it pointless) nor does it require that gifts should be exchanged at the same moment on both sides. They may be spread over a period, provided that the attitude and the spirit of reciprocity are maintained. It is more a human question than one of strict mathematical equivalence. Further reference will be made in a moment to the importance of the human element in co-operation. A number of technical and structural obstacles to co-operation nonetheless remain. They were analysed in two of the introductory statements, and there is no need to return to them here.

3. *Frameworks for Co-operation*

There was not time to make a systematic analysis of all the frameworks for co-operation or to evaluate their respective advantages and disadvantages. This task was attempted, however, in the earlier IAU meeting reported on in *Paper* No. 9, and it might be useful to make a reference to the section devoted to "Patterns of International University Co-operation" on pages 25-29 of the English edition. But in anticipation of the report of the present Seminar, some special matters may be noted here.

Firstly, it is important for the universities concerned to play a key rôle in the planning and operation of programmes of co-operation. In countries practising self-management, this may appear obvious, but it was pointed out that it is by no means a bad thing for a third party—for example, a foundation or other fund-providing body—to play the rôle of initiator in negotiations. One of the participants particularly stressed this.

Secondly, regional co-operation seems to be becoming increasingly important in the modern world. This impression possibly arose because regional organizations were quite strongly represented at the Seminar, but it does seem to correspond to a real situation. The example of RIHED should be mentioned here; an institute which not only provides consultative arrangements, but also organic co-operation between universities and governments in a developing region. This example should be carefully assessed.

Thirdly, several participants insisted on the international and world-wide aspect of co-operation which, through the indispensable regional, linguistic, religious and other forms, should be kept in mind. Special reference was made to the rôle of IAU as a world-wide organization, and the need for its further development.

Fourthly, there is a point worth recalling as important, though it was raised by only one participant. Countries which engage in co-operation or aid on a large scale are obliged to work out a policy for co-operation—in other words, to make choices. Whether these choices are made by governments or by bodies such as the League of Yugoslav Universities, they are essential if the allocation of personnel and resources is to be done in good time. In particular, decisions must be taken about the national groups with which it is proposed to co-operate; about the academic disciplines involved; about the levels of study; and about the forms of training. These choices are all necessary, but to countries or universities wishing to set up co-operative links which fall outside the established policies of the partner they may appear to involve the laying down of unacceptable conditions. Here too, mutual understanding and prior exchange of information are indispensable if disappointments and unjustified resentment are to be avoided.

Lastly, and in a similar context, the importance of the resources used in co-operation was underlined. As things are at present, ambitious programmes are difficult to finance from the resources of universities themselves and their various associations. Governments and foundations are obviously the principal sources available. Those organizations and officials who are concerned with the allocation of financial resources in the service of co-operation, particularly government funds, thus play an indispensable part, and it would be regrettable if their efforts were regarded with a kind of generalized suspicion. Certainly, they must show

respect for the dignity of the other partners, but their policies should be judged in relation to their results and not in relation to the origin of the financial resources which made them possible.

These considerations lead quite naturally to the question of criteria for the evaluation of co-operation.

4. *Criteria for the Elaboration and Evaluation of Programmes of Co-operation*

Discussions at the Seminar were more concerned with criteria which enabled programmes of co-operation to be set up with a reasonable chance of success, than with those by which they could be judged *a posteriori* although these were not completely neglected. A detailed analysis of them (with classifications and a coherent system of inter-relations for criteria) is particularly difficult to make, as was pointed out, because they vary considerably from one type of programme to another. Discussion during the Seminar was above all concerned with criteria for the exchange of persons, in particular students, university teachers and research workers, but it was mentioned that there are others, briefly referred to at the Seminar, but more fully dealt with in *Paper* No. 9.

It should also be noted that the criteria proposed in the papers presented by the two speakers on this question met with general acceptance. A few elements emerge from them particularly clearly.

— The first lies in the importance of the choice of individuals. We were reminded of the saying that "human beings are the only real wealth", and that co-operation can only exist between human beings, even if they have to work through organizations and administrative structures. It is of the highest importance that people who co-operate should be not only strongly motivated, but also lucid and well-informed. The Seminar was told of the success of inter-university co-operation in the multi-national community represented by the Soviet Union. This success was, perhaps, partly due to the fact that co-operation there was the work of men united by a common determination to build something new, and the same could be said of the results achieved in Yugoslavia through the stimulus of the League of Yugoslav Universities.

— Despite the crucial rôle of human beings, however, co-operation in most cases must be institutionalized, though this does not mean that it must be dominated by bureaucracies. Information collected in advance and advance planning can only be beneficial and, above all, co-operation can only set itself clearly defined and mutually acceptable goals on the basis of common agreement. These goals must, obviously, be compatible with the financial resources available and, if necessary, modest in scope. Finally, institutionalization is the only guarantee of that element of continuity which cannot be sufficiently ensured by the changing careers and destinies of individuals. To give an example which was quoted during the discussions, the Dubrovnik Seminar entitled "The University Today" has certainly owed its success to the initiative and even the courage of determined individuals, but everyone is happy that it has been institutionalized and consequently become firmly established over the years.

— *A posteriori* criteria for evaluation raise very delicate problems in that they must combine quantifiable elements with others which cannot be measured or calculated. But this does not leave us entirely at a loss. Certain indicators may be usefully adopted, notably the multiplying and

cumulative effect of some programmes—for example, a course planned as a temporary one but which leads to the establishment of a permanent multi-disciplinary and multinational team of research workers. In the United States a special kind of evaluation has been carried out through detailed surveys of certain categories of foreign students, who were asked to make retrospective analyses of their experience in that country, in both its positive and negative aspects. This is perhaps costly, but has given most instructive results.

— Although a number of elements emerged with sufficient clarity to be included in the final report, no systematic typology for these criteria could be worked out. We are not at the end of our difficulties in this question.

The Rector of the University of Belgrade was able to say yesterday evening that the Seminar had been a success. It has doubtless contributed to removing some misunderstandings, and has made us more aware of the necessity for co-operation both for universities and for the human communities they serve. Some of the negative reactions caused by the mistakes of the past should not lead us to doubt its essential value. We have not been able to work out a precise typology, but we have at least outlined some of the first principles of a "demonology" of co-operation, and we have perhaps helped to exorcize that prince of demons whom Goethe defined in Faust as "the one who always denies". Many examples of successful co-operation were given during the Seminar, particularly those which concern the strengthening of university departments of education in Africa and the creation of centres of advanced study in India. Such examples seem particularly encouraging, and the creation of "centres of excellence" in the developing countries may eventually help them to build up original development models, of which the need was stressed by one of the participants. The general public, perhaps too obsessed by the conflicts which divide the modern world, does not always perceive the daily and continual benefits of international co-operation, and perhaps does not realize how wide it is. Universities and their various organizations must struggle constantly against this negative attitude.

On behalf of our IAU Secretariat we must conclude by hoping that we have not introduced another demon into this room this morning—the demon of boredom.

Closing Discussion

Sir Hugh Springer thanked Mr. Daillant. He had presented a very good summary of the main lines of the discussions. If any of the participants felt that a particular point had been omitted or insufficiently emphasized, or if they wished to re-open discussion on any question, the floor was now open.

Dr. HOLLAND believed that the reference to frameworks for co-operation in the aide-mémoire did not do justice to the rôle of IAU itself as a world centre for co-ordination and documentation. This was no doubt attributable to the modesty of the Secretariat. But although much attention had been paid to regional co-operation some participants had drawn attention to the genuinely international character of IAU and this should be emphasized once again in the closing discussion.

Professor RYBNIKOV spoke of the fundamental importance of the aims and purposes of co-operation. They were inseparable from the aims and purposes of the university itself. The next General Conference of

IAU would be asked to consider what basic objectives the universities of the world should set themselves, and for this they would make use of the reports of the Seminars. The report of the present Seminar should, therefore, bring out clearly what had been said about the purposes of co-operation. In the majority of countries the universities were the most democratic institutions in society and in the interests of all mankind this characteristic should also find its expression internationally.

In his paper Dr. Cuevas del Cid had pointed out that university co-operation should contribute to the preservation of human dignity and to the search for new and more just forms of life as well as for the establishment of peace based on social justice. These points should be re-emphasized in the present discussion.

It was also important to draw attention to examples of successful co-operation, such as those mentioned by Dr. Kirpal.

Finally it was to be hoped that, given the importance of the subject, the published report of the Seminar would be drafted with great care, as had been the reports of the earlier seminars.

Professor DISCHAMPS asked whether the published text of his paper might include certain passages that he had felt obliged to omit when presenting it in order not to exceed the time allocated to him.

Sir Hugh SPRINGER believed that the participants would be happy to agree to this request.

Mr. GRIFFITHS felt that the aide-mémoire was an excellent document. He hoped, however, that greater emphasis could be placed on the usefulness of the efforts of those engaged in the task of seeking funds for co-operation; this might help to dispel misunderstandings which could arise in connection with certain programmes. At the present time the programmes of co-operation needed by the university community could not be financed simply from the resources of the universities themselves and from the membership dues they paid to their associations. Machinery was needed to seek the necessary funds from governments, from foundations and from other sources, on condition that the dignity of all the partners involved was scrupulously respected, together with their right to share in the planning and evaluation of the programmes carried out.

Dr. Kirpal congratulated the Secretariat on the aide-mémoire and asked what arrangements would be made for publishing the report of the Seminar.

Mr. Aitken outlined the plan for publishing the report, stressing that a draft would first be submitted for comment and approval to the participants and to the members of the Administrative Board of IAU. The printed report was expected to appear at the end of 1974 or early in 1975.

Sir Hugh Springer said that the warm thanks of the participants were due to the Secretariat, to the interpreters, as well as to all those in Belgrade who had helped to organize the Seminar and the stay of the participants in Yugoslavia. It was not possible to mention every name but the Seminar was specially indebted to Mr. Stijović.

Mr. Keyes thanked the participants on behalf of the Association and expressed the hope that they would be able to take part in its next General Conference, to be held at the University of Moscow in August 1975.

Mr. Stijović thanked the participants for their kindness and co-operation. He was warmly applauded and on this note Sir Hugh Springer declared the Seminar closed.

PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Amnuay Tapingkae,
Director, Regional Institute of Higher Education and Research, Singapore

M. Maurice Beutler,
Secrétaire général adjoint, Association des universités partiellement ou entièrement de langue française, Montréal

Dr. R. Cuevas del Cid,
Secretario General del Consejo Superior Universitario Centroamericano, San José

Professeur J.-C. Dischamps,
Président, Université de Nice
Comité permanent, Conférence permanente des Recteurs et Vice-Chanceliers des Universités européennes, Genève

Professor Stevan Gaber,
Rector, University of Skopje
Vice-President, League of Yugoslav Universities

Professor Jovan Gligorijević,
Rector, University of Belgrade

Dr. Lameck K.H. Goma,
Vice-Chancellor, University of Zambia, Lusaka

Mr. R.C. Griffiths,
Director, Inter-University Council for Higher Education Overseas, London

Dr. Kenneth Holland,
Former President, Institute of International Education, New York

Dr. Prem Kirpal,
President, Institute of Cultural Relations and Development Studies, New Delhi

Mgr G. Leclercq,
Secretary-General, International Federation of Catholic Universities, Paris

Dr. Y.K. Lule,
Secretary General, Association of African Universities, Accra

Dr. V.O. Miller,
Rector, Latvian State University, Riga

Dr. Efrén C. del Pozo,
Secretario General, Unión de Universidades de America Latina, México

Dr. Manfred Ribbing,
Director, European Centre for Higher Education, Bucharest (Unesco)

Professor K.A. Rybnikov,
Department of Mathematics, State University of Moscow
Dr. Makoto Saito,
Dean, Faculty of Law, University of Tokyo
Sir Hugh Springer,
Secretary-General, Association of Commonwealth Universities, London
Mr. Stephen Stackpole,
Director, Commonwealth Program, Carnegie Corporation of New York

Observers

Professor Predrag Vranicki,
Rector, University of Zagreb
Vice-President, League of Yugoslav Universities
Professor Ladislav Varga,
Pro-Rector, University of Novi Sad
Professor Enver Humo,
Pro-Rector, University of Sarajevo
Professor Dragoslav Stojanović-Sip,
Rector, University of the Arts, Belgrade
Professor Vladimir Marković,
Pro-Rector, University of the Arts, Belgrade
Mr. Tihomir Vulović,
Secretary-General, League of Yugoslav Universities
Mr. Svet Babić,
Advisor for International Scientific Co-operation
Professor Miroslav Popović,
Pro-Rector, University of Belgrade
Professor Novice Mitić,
Pro-Rector, University of Belgrade
Professor Milan Vesović,
Pro-Rector, University of Belgrade
Professor Branko Pribićević,
University of Belgrade
Professor Danilo Pejin,
University of Belgrade
Professor Slobodan Radosavgević,
Former Rector, University of Belgrade
Professor Zlatiboz Petrović,
University of Belgrade
Mr. Momir Jovanović,
Secretary-General, University of Belgrade

***

97

International Association of Universities

Mr. H.M.R. KEYES,
Secretary-General
Mr. D.J. AITKEN,
Assistant Secretary-General
M. G. DAILLANT,
Secrétaire général adjoint
Mr. P.H. WHITE,
Executive Assistant

University of Belgrade Organizing Committee

Mr. DRAGIŠA STIJOVIĆ,
Head, Department of International University Relations,
University of Belgrade

INTERPRETERS

Discussions at the Seminar were conducted in English, French and Serbo-Croat.

Simultaneous translation was provided in French and English by James Poole and Carol Ades; to and from Serbo-Croat by Kiril Svinarski, Vida Janković, Olga Bambić, Jasmiana Lubajlovic, Kolja Lajkannović and Mirjana Joanović, with Mladen Kostić (technician).

WORKING PROGRAMME

Monday, 6 May

Inaugural Session

Introduction of Theme:
The Purpose and Significance of Co-operation

Discussion of Theme

Tuesday, 7 May

Introduction of Theme:
Reciprocity in Co-operation: Obstacles and Advantages

Discussion of Theme

Introduction of Theme:
Frameworks for Co-operation: Institutional, National, Regional, International

Discussion of Theme

Wednesday, 8 May

Introduction of Theme:
Criteria for the Evaluation of Co-operation

Discussion of Theme

Thursday, 9 May

Discussion of Theme (continued)

Friday, 10 May

General Appraisal of Discussions

Closing Session

ANNEX

The study on which the present publication is based is not the first undertaken by the International Association of Universities in this field. One dealing specifically with formal programmes of co-operation between university institutions was carried out by the Association in 1959 at the request of Unesco and with its financial support.

It was made by a Committee composed of the following, who were members of the Association's Administrative Board at the time: Dr. J. Baugniet, University of Brussels, then President of the Association; Dr. C.K. Zurayk, Professor of History, American University of Beirut, former Rector, University of Damascus; the late Dr. N. Carrillo, then Rector, National University of Mexico; the late Dr. F. C. James, then Principal and Vice-Chancellor, McGill University; Dr. T. Morito, then President, Hiroshima University; and Mr. H.M.R. Keyes, Secretary-General, International Association of Universities. The Committee met at Unesco House in Paris from 21 August to 4 September, 1959, under the Chairmanship of Dr. J. Baugniet and with Dr. C.K.Zurayk as Rapporteur.

The field of co-operation in which universities or their members are engaged in one way or another was considered too vast to be tackled usefully by an enquiry which had to be conducted on a modest scale. The terms of reference of the Committee therefore were limited, and it was asked to examine forms of co-operation which had arisen from *official arrangements* made by a university with one or more universities in other countries, either on their own initiative or with the aid of foundations, governmental bodies or intergovernmental agencies.

Wishing to be as practical as possible in its approach, the Committee spent a substantial part of its time in critical examination of reports on programmes of co-operation which had actually been carried out. The information which had been collected for it revealed great diversity in the nature and purposes of these programmes and, basing itself on administrative rather than academic or intellectual considerations, the Committee found it useful to classify the various areas of formal co-operation under the following headings:

I. Academic organization and administration.

II. Establishment or development of particular faculties, departments and research institutes.

   a) Programmes of limited duration between two or more university institutions for the specific purpose of creating a new faculty department or research institute.

b) Programmes of limited duration between two or more university institutions for the specific purpose of strengthening or reorganizing a particular faculty, department or research institute.

c) Programmes of continuing collaboration between two or more university institutions to enrich the work of particular faculties, departments or research institutes of one or of all institutions concerned.

III. Teaching and research.

IV. Inter-university conferences, seminars and meetings.

V. Student exchanges.

VI. University celebrations, delegations, friendship weeks.

The Committee also found it practical to classify the various types of arrangement for carrying out these different forms of co-operation. It used the following headings:

I. Arrangements made directly between university institutions on their own account and with their own resources.

II. Arrangements made between university institutions arising from their membership of official university bodies.

III. Arrangements made between university institutions with the participation of a private foundation or similar body.

IV. Arrangements made between two or more university institutions and a governmental agency.

V. Arrangements made between two or more university institutions and an intergovernmental agency.

The Committee's examination led to the formulation of twelve specific recommendations:

1. *Greater concern among universities for inter-university co-operation.*

Faced as they are by the tremendous challenges of this age, many universities throughout the world are reconsidering their basic responsibilities and are attempting to reformulate their historic mission in the light of present-day requirements.

It is suggested that in this "prise de conscience", universities should pay particular attention to their opportunities and their duties in the field of inter-university co-operation. In doing so they would be grounding themselves more firmly in their own tradition and, at the same time, helping themselves, individually and collectively, to accomplish successfully the new tasks with which they are confronted.

As a result of this increased concern for inter-university co-operation, universities will be more ready to seek and appropriate funds from within their own resources for such co-operation, even when they are facing great difficulties in providing for their own needs, and will exert greater efforts to overcome the obstacles which stand in the way of fruitful participation in these programmes by their faculties and students.

We should not in any way minimize the difficulties that universities, even the older and highly developed ones, are finding to recruit adequate

101

personnel for their own rapidly developing needs. Today this is largely a matter of training and encouraging the development of qualified men and women, since the supply of properly trained candidates is inadequate in every country. But we suggest that, together with their efforts to meet their own needs, universities should strive to meet the additional requirements which inter-university and international collaboration place on their shoulders. Universities would facilitate the task of this collaboration if they normally plan to train and recruit an additional increment of staff for the purpose of inter-university exchange or assistance, or, at least, if they develop the means of locating and recruiting such staff so as to be able to make rapid and effective use of opportunities of co-operation when they arise.

The task of collaboration would also be facilitated if universities and governments work out policies and procedures which would allow their staff, whenever the nature of the programme demands it, to obtain leave of absence which may extend to as long as three years, without losing status or promotion and retirements rights.

The success of programmes of inter-university co-operation depends ultimately upon the faith of the universities in this co-operation as an integral part of their mission.

2. *Co-operation based on planning.*

To be truly effective, and for their own balanced development, inter-university co-operation should be integrated as far as possible into the overall and rational planning of the institutions concerned. Otherwise an institution may not receive what it primarily needs, nor give what another institution really lacks. The benefit derived from co-operation may be only marginal, and in certain cases programmes of co-operation may prove in the long run to be actually harmful by creating an imbalance in the total programmes of some institutions.

It is suggested that the objective of inter-university co-operation should be the mutual strengthening and enrichment of universities through the development of the distinctive capacities of each one on the basis of rational planning by universities, as well as on an inter-university level.

Although a great deal of study has been carried out by various university and inter-university bodies on the relative importance of humanism, science and technology within the framework of a university, the Committee feels that a wider and more thorough analysis is urgently needed. It recommends that either Unesco or IAU should promote the diffusion of the results of these studies, and explore the possibilities of undertaking a comprehensive investigation, on a world-wide basis, of the balance of studies within a university. Such an investigation will provide the standard that will permit an individual university to plan more satisfactorily its own development, and to seek appropriate aid from other institutions.

3. *Outside agencies.*

A large part of the co-operation already achieved has been made possible by financial assistance from outside bodies. However, as has already been noted, programmes supported by governments or governmental agencies cannot but be affected by political considerations. And these considerations, particularly in programmes of assistance, loom prominentyl

in the attitude of the recipient country when agreements are concluded between a world power and a small State.

These problems would be greatly alleviated if all resources allocated by governments for this purpose were pooled in an international fund, which would be used for the strict purposes of university collaboration and assistance, independent of political pressures and considerations.

It is realized by the Committee that such pooling would involve very important changes in present governmental policies and that many other serious problems would be raised, but it feels that such a principle should be recognized to be most desirable for the ultimate success of international action in this field.

It is our considered opinion that the contribution of outside agencies achieves the best results when it is limited to aiding the programmes of co-operation evolved by the universities, or to suggesting constructive areas of collaboration. Inter-university co-operation is most useful when it is undertaken as a result of direct negotiation and arrangement between universities themselves, and when universities enjoy the utmost freedom in the initiation and execution of the programmes in question.

4. *Reciprocity.*

It is suggested that collaboration between universities should be based on the mutual recognition of university standards and of the equality in nature, if not in resources, of universities. The principle of reciprocity may not, in present circumstances, be strictly adhered to in the sense that a younger and less developed university be expected to send the same number and type of people to an older and more developed one. The main point is that the feeling should be created that an exchange is taking place, that a process is being initiated which will eventually lead to a genuine exchange between two bodies which are of the same "species", and profoundly akin. Both superiority and inferiority complexes should be eradicated.

New universities in economically underdeveloped countries are in many cases able to provide services which are not obvious at first glance. There is no doubt that such universities can be helpful to older universities in fields such as archaeology, philology, comparative religion and philosophy, history, economic and social studies, and various other areas of investigation. Every attempt should be made to discover and make use of the contribution which a less developed university can make.

5. *Long-term or short-term arrangements.*

It is suggested that long-term arrangements are more valuable than short-term ones. On the one hand, their benefit becomes cumulative and, on the other, they are not as subject as the latter to change of policies or financial exigencies. They afford a surer basis for sound planning.

Short-term arrangements are most effective when they are entered into in the context of the university's long-term needs and plans.

In view of the fact that outside funds are usually subject to annual decisions, it is most important that contributing outside agencies allocate funds which are, as far as possible, free from this restriction, so that the planning and execution of the arrangements can be carried out with a sense of assurance and continuity. Whenever, as is often the case, such agencies cannot guarantee long-term financing, it is important that they

explore the possibility of establishing financial arrangements that will enable them to give at least six months notice of the termination of any project.

6. *Duration of exchange professorships or lectureships.*

Short visits of professors for a few days are, in many cases, not very helpful. Although they bring certain educational and international benefits, these benefits are not always commensurate with their costs. It is suggested that exchange visits by professors should be sufficiently long for the professor to render a genuine contribution to the university. For old institutions with developed and continuing programmes, no less than one month should be allowed for these visits. For programmes of assistance to new universities, the minimum time, in the Committee's view, should be six months.

7. *Integration of exchange teaching with university curricula.*

When teaching by exchange professors falls outside the regular curriculum of the university, it usually does not have the same impact as when it forms part of the curriculum. It is suggested that, as far as possible, institutions should strive to integrate exchange programmes within their curricula. The professor would thus share in a definite part of the programme required from the students, giving his own particular contribution to it within a definite context rather than in an incidental manner.

It is important that these and other programmes of collaboration be integrated within the particular academic units of the university. Whenever they are isolated by themselves or set up as independent units, they lose in their total or cumulative effect and do not adequately promote the integral and long-term development of the university.

8. *Regional or world-wide co-operation.*

Regional exchanges between university teachers and students and the establishment of departments or institutes to serve particular regions—such as the Regional Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Chile, or regional institutes for the Arabic-speaking countries of the Middle East—are valuable forms of inter-university co-operation. They reduce the costs of such co-operation and help the cultural development of the region. Students participating in these exchanges pursue their studies through languages and in cultural atmospheres which are familiar to them and become more firmly attached to their roots.

Completely different from such efforts to develop within a special region educational facilities of outstanding quality, is the wider exchange of students and professors of different cultures. In this case, to which the East-West Major Project of Unesco is directed, the purpose of the exchange is to introduce the teacher or student to a culture different from his own. It should be emphasized that exchanges of this kind are of vital importance to Western universities and Western communities which, in most cases, have but a meagre knowledge of Eastern culture, history, and philosophy. In many respects inter-university co-operation can be most fruitful when it brings together universities of different political and ideological tendencies, or when it is directed to the development of mutual understanding between East and West.

9. *Technical assistance or cultural exchange.*

It is suggested that, great as has been the contribution of programmes of technical assistance to universities in economically under-developed countries, the time will soon arrive, if it has not already done so, when the idea of technical assistance will cease to be attractive to these institutions. Cultural exchange lies more within the tradition of inter-university co-operation, and it is believed that this co-operation will be enhanced and activated if its integrity is preserved, and if it is not dominated by programmes of technical assistance.

As a result of the de-emphasizing of technical assistance and the emphasizing of cultural exchange in inter-university co-operation, more balanced programmes of collaboration will be undertaken. While universities in economically under-developed countries are in need of technical assistance for the development of professional education, there is no doubt that there is an overall need for exchange in the humanities and social sciences. If universities are not only groups of technical institutes and professional faculties, but genuine centres for the discovery and the promotion of universal human values, then the need for exchange in the humanities is no less important for the future of the universities and the world as a whole, than the need for the diffusion of techniques, even if the latter may seem more urgent and pressing.

10. *Recruitment.*

In programmes involving agreements between two universities, it seems that the best results in the recruitment of personnel have been obtained in those instances where the agency responsible for recruiting was the regular academic unit or department of the university concerned. Such departments are usually more cognizant of the available candidates in their fields, and could do a much better job interviewing and evaluating credentials and attracting outstanding people than could special recruiting agencies, either within or without the university.

Taking into consideration the difficulties in recruitment alluded to in the previous chapter, it is suggested that these difficulties would be reduced if the responsibilities for recruitment were delegated to those who are professionally active in the respective fields in the universities, and able to judge the professional qualifications and motivations of the available candidates.

11. *Student programmes.*

In the matter of student exchanges, it appears that greater value is derived when such exchanges are made on the graduate level. Graduate students are more apt to benefit from them in their specialities than furthering undergraduates.

However, there is a very good case for encouraging exchanges of undergraduate students for the purposes of general education and the diffusion of international-mindedness and inter-cultural understanding. But such exchanges, to be of genuine benefit, must be carefully planned by both the sending and the recipient universities, whether it be in the selection of the students, the elaboration of the academic and extra-curricular programmes concerned, or in the provision of adequate housing and other material requirements.

12. *Diffusion of information on university needs and resources for the purposes of co-operation.*

Mention has already been made in the general recommendations above of the need for an information centre on university collaboration. However, the effectiveness of programmes of inter-university co-operation will be enhanced also by diffusing as widely as possible information on university needs and possibilities in this field of mutual co-operation.

Serious consideration should therefore be given to the possibility of the establishment of a co-ordinating agency within the framework of the IAU or Unesco. Such an agency would be helpful to universities by serving as a clearing house for their needs and their available resources for co-operation. Some services are already provided by the International Universities Bureau, the permanent secretariat of the IAU, but the resources at its disposal are very limited. Adequate means should be found for the development of this work, whether within the IAU or in other contexts.

The Committee concluded its report with the following statement:

"The university is a unique institution. It is dedicated to the pursuit of truth. Truth is not the monopoly of any one nation, race or culture. Hence the task of the university is basically universal. While it has responsibilities to its own society, it has also a distinct responsibility to promote universal values and to serve mankind as a whole.

Thus the Committee cannot but emphasize again, at the conclusion of its report, that international co-operation is of the essence of the university. To be genuinely effective, this co-operation should grow as the result of an awakened sense of responsibility on the part of the universities, of sound planning of their resources and needs, and of full freedom in the promotion of co-operation among them, as well as in the discharge of their tasks in general."

***

Another study dealt with the areas and patterns of international university co-operation.

It was made by a Working Party specially set up by the Administrative Board of IAU. The members of this Working Party were: Dr. I. González G., Rector, University of Concepción, Chile; Dr. G.P. Gorshkov, Professor, University of Moscow; Dr. B. Janković, Rector, University of Niš, President of the League of Yugoslav Universities; Dr. Mohammed Moursi Ahmed, Rector, University of Cairo; Dr. R.M. Myers, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, University of New South Wales, Kensington, Sydney; Dr. G.D. Parikh, Rector, University of Bombay; Dr. A.T. Porter, Principal, University College, Nairobi, University of East Africa; Dr. K. Thompson, Vice-President, Rockefeller Foundation; and M.J. Sirinelli, Rector, University of Limoges. They met in Paris from 8 to 11 April 1968 under the chairmanship of Dr. C.K. Zurayk, then President of the Association. The Summary Record of their discussions, included in Paper No. 9 of the Association is reproduced below.*

* *International University Co-operation*, IAU *Paper* No 9 ; 1969, x + 161 p. ISBN 92-9002-115-2.

Areas of International University Co-operation

A. Teaching and study

i) *Exchange of Teachers.*

It was agreed first of all that there was a shortage of teachers in all parts of the world, though this was more acute or even dramatic in some countries than in others. At the same time that many new universities were being set up almost *ex nihilo* in the developing countries, universities in the developed countries were passing through an unprecedented crisis of growth, caused by the conjunction of many different factors: the "democratization" of higher education; the rapid increase of the need for specialists in economic systems depending more and more on scientific technology, and the explosive expansion of knowledge itself. As Dr. Thompson suggested, this situation could be temporary and was likely to become gradually stabilized. But for the moment it created a condition of extreme tension, for everywhere the need for co-operation and mutual aid was rising dramatically at a time when it was becoming more and more difficult to satisfy.

In some ways, the shortage of teachers had only a limited influence on exchanges in the full sense, that is to say on exchanges based on reciprocity. The professor going to teach elsewhere was in those cases replaced by a foreign colleague so that in terms of numbers the situation—good or bad—was not changed. Traditional exchanges between well-established universities were not greatly affected by the shortage of personnel. Clearly they could be greatly extended, and they were still encountering an extensive series of obstacles of an economic, administrative, or even political and psychological kind, as would appear later, but they were not a critical issue at the present time. The sense of crisis often in an extremely urgent form, arose principally in the universities of certain areas of the "third world", which still needed a large proportion of foreign teachers and which had the greatest difficulty in finding highly enough qualified ones, or in retaining their services for periods long enough for their presence to be really effective. For these reasons the working party gave its main attention to the international recruitment of teachers for universities in countries most affected by the present crisis.

International recruitment, it was noted, raised a series of distinct but inter-connected problems: problems of "spotting" candidates for teaching posts abroad; problems of mobilizing teachers for this form of co-operation, notably by suitable career arrangements; problems of finance problems arising from travel restrictions.

a) *Identification of teachers for posts abroad.*

With regard to the identification of potential candidates for posts abroad, many universities did not seem to know where to look when they needed to recruit foreign help or were, to say the least, reduced to a limited range of contacts based on historical factors or the consequences of the old colonial system. For example, an English-speaking university in Africa had contacts with the United Kingdom, and a French-speaking one with France, but neither was sure of the procedures to be adopted in seeking

candidates from other countries. In many cases, these traditional sources of recruitment were no longer adequate, either quantitatively or qualitatively (even if new conditions were borne in mind, such as the considerable efforts made by the United Arab Republic to help other African universities). Quantitatively, it was not possible to find teachers in adequate numbers. Qualitatively, they had a tendency to prolong the structures and outlook of the old metropolitan countries and thus hinder the adaptation of universities to national needs, at the very time that discovery of new solutions could be helped by the presence of teachers from other regions and by the confrontation of differing traditions within the same university.

Accepting this general definition of the problem, the working party examined several kinds of solution.

First of all the question was raised as to whether this matter could be dealt with on a world-wide scale, at full international level and by international means. Undoubtedly, this solution would be the most comprehensive and probably the most satisfactory if it could be made workable. The working party therefore examined the conditions and methods by which such a system might be organized.

International list of teachers for posts abroad.

One possible method would be the compilation and regular publication of a list of persons ready to accept teaching posts in foreign countries. Discussion of this idea, however, immediately revealed a number of serious objections to it:

—The drawing up of such a list on the full international scale would represent a very considerable task and one which—without mentioning costs—would involve such delays that it would be largely out-of-date before it appeared.

—A mere list of names would be quite inadequate. To be really worthwhile, such a list would have to include an element of evaluation or at least objective comment on those concerned, and this would make it still more difficult to complete and publish.

—Teachers of real quality would doubtless be reluctant to allow their names to appear in a document of this kind, even if they were perfectly willing to accept the offer of a particular post in a particular foreign university. There would also be great danger that such a list might contain a high proportion of people whose careers had been undistinguished in their own countries.

—It was important to bear in mind that these objections seemed to be corroborated by a practical experiment which had been tried by Unesco some years ago in collaboration with the IAU. Unesco had prepared a list under the title "Teaching Abroad" and this had been distributed as a supplement to the IAU *Bulletin*. The experiment had not been successful and was discontinued.

With these facts in mind, the working party decided that it was unable to recommend the drawing up of an international list of candidates for teaching posts abroad.

As Dr. Thompson stressed, however, it recognized the value of the lists prepared (notably in the USA) by a number of scientific, disciplinary or professional organizations where standards were generally speaking rigorous. In certain cases, consultation of these lists could be very useful, but the working party felt that multi-disciplinary international lists of the kind mentioned earlier could not be drawn up in the same way.

List of vacant posts.

Another type of list might be concerned not with candidates for vacant posts, but with the posts themselves. In this field there was an important example of an international list, for Unesco had published since 1963 a brochure entitled "Teachers for Africa", which set out posts vacant in the African universities (except for the United Arab Republic where a special situation existed, in that this country was itself giving important assistance to others). The working party agreed that this list was of great value and expressed the hope that it would be continued and, if possible, extended to other parts of the world, particularly Latin America and Asia.

International information centre.

Beyond the publication of lists, a more ambitious form of action was theoretically possible. This would consist of the creation of an important agency for information and selection which, on a permanent basis, could maintain registers of eventual candidates for teaching posts abroad and vacant posts in different countries, put the parties concerned in touch with each other, and be able to supply information both about candidates and posts open for recruitment. By keeping its information constantly up-to-date, and by ensuring continuous contact between supply and demand, such an international university labour exchange might be able to overcome many of the shortcomings pointed out by the working party in the mere issue of lists. However, for such an exchange to work satisfactorily at the international level it would require a large and costly establishment, almost certainly needing computers, and it was not at present clear what agency would be able or willing to finance it. There was a further danger that it might introduce an undesirable element of bureaucratic or technocratic de-personalization into the field of university recruitment, in which the personal element should be of the highest importance.

Better use of existing services—Recommendation.

Finally, such an agency would involve a waste of resources in so far as it might duplicate recruiting services already in existence or which were beginning to grow up in the developed countries and within certain cultural areas such as the Commonwealth. The working party agreed that at the present stage at least it was precisely these services which offered the greatest promise of improving the present situation. It therefore recommended action on three main points:

—the strengthening and development of existing national and regional services, whether governmental, university or inter-university;

—the establishment of links between them, if possible through co-ordination first of all at the regional level (geographical or cultural regions and, as need arose, their progressive enlargement);

—the establishment of better arrangements for existing bureaus and services to be more widely publicized. In this connection it was noted that Unesco's *Teachers for Africa* listed these and that the *World List of Universities* published by the IAU tried to mention them systematically in its sections dealing with university organizations in each country. Taking these lists as a base, the working party believed that more direct relations between them could be established. University heads who seeking to recruit foreign staff could, for example, make personal contact with the organizations in question. Personal visits of this kind could at any rate

be the beginning of more regular relationships and universities might then send lists of their needs more systematically. In spite of the general shortage of teaching staff, a number of universities were perfectly ready to allow members of their teaching staffs to go abroad, but were prevented from doing so by their lack of exact information concerning needs. Dr. Gorshkov, for instance, gave specific examples of this and suggested that where Ministries existed which were responsible for the whole field of higher education in a country, universities which wished to obtain the services of teachers from that country should send precise lists of their requirements to them. Where Ministries of this kind did not exist the procedure would doubtless be less simple, but requests could be sent to other governmental, non-governmental or inter-university agencies which were specifically concerned with teaching abroad.

Rôle of recruiting services and their limitations.

Lastly, so that no misunderstanding about the function of these central services and bureaus concerned with recruitment should arise, the working party stressed that their rôle should normally be limited to that of intermediaries. There should be no question of some kind of bureaucratic substitution for universities in the essential matter of the choice of their staffs. Their task should be to bring those concerned into contact with each other —universities, faculties or individual professors— and these should have complete freedom to reach agreement on the details of their mutual arrangements. In the view of the working party, co-operation which arose from direct contacts between universities was the ideal one. As Dr. Gonzalez stressed particularly, this guaranteed more clarity and more continuity in the engagements entered into and these elements were essential for real success. On an international scale, however, universities still knew little about each other and intermediary organizations were necessary to supply appropriate information. It was essential that such agencies should not themselves be responsible for choices, and that within the framework of a given programme of technical assistance, for example, a university should not have people allocated to it without its own agreement. This would be a form of neo-colonialism, and in certain cases in fact it already existed. In every case it was important for "assisted" universities to have the decisive word in the choice of those who would assist them.

In the present situation, this choice could be made from only a very limited number of persons, and in addition to the need to identify them, it was equally necessary to increase their numbers as much as possible by mobilizing more teachers for the tasks of international co-operation.

b) *Mobilization of teachers for posts abroad.*

Increase of numbers.

This increase of the number of academic staff available for co-operation raised problems quite different from those of identification mentioned above. They affect the life and policies of every university very profoundly. It was not merely a matter of creating information agencies and others concerned with negociations and contracts, but of creating actual reserves of people within the university field and of setting up structures which would allow these reserves to be guided into co operative work.

Non-university organizations were certainly able to give considerable help in this field. Unesco in particular had been operating training

programmes for a number of years for teaching staff in African and Latin American countries. These programmes had already trained some 250 teachers and the working party hoped that they could be extended.

Such an extension, however, could not reasonably be expected to meet already existing needs and those foreseen in the future. These were so great that only a powerful effort on the part of the university community could meet them.

As a general measure, therefore, the working party recommended that universities which were willing to provide help for others—and this in the main meant the universities of the developed countries—should make systematic attempts to create and fill a number of posts beyond their own immediate needs. The meeting of heads of African universities in Khartoum in 1963 had expressed the hope that this level of "excess" personnel should be carried to 20%. This was an ambitious figure which could not be applied automatically and would have to vary according to disciplines, but it had the merit of staking a claim and highlighting the size of what needed to be done.

The working party was not itself ready to put forward a precise percentage in this way. It also believed that expressions like "excess" personnel or "over-staffing" were ambitious, and could give the impression that co-operation was not a normal and essential university function but something superfluous—a luxury.

In its view the important thing was that universities should try as far as possible to recruit adequate staffs, that is to say staffs capable, over and above the needs of each institution, of undertaking the crucial work of co-operation. Such a deliberate recruitment policy would require prolonged efforts of persuasion among the authorities responsible for credits for the creation of university posts. But good examples could be contagious.

Changes in career systems favouring co-operation.

It was also necessary for this reserve of teachers to be actually available for co-operation, and this involved special arrangements in career systems. Many university people hesitated to accept a post abroad because of the negative effects which a prolonged absence could have on their careers in their own countries or their own universities. In consequence there was either complete abstention, or limited application for engagements of short duration which in fact were sometimes merely half-engagements, since those concerned made only a physical move, but morally and intellectually remained at home. As Dr. Porter pointed out, a visiting teacher might take up to a year to install himself and then leave with little accomplished other than the elements of a teaching system conceived more in relation to the interests of his own career than to the real needs of the university he had visited. For a period abroad to yield all its benefits, particularly in a young university where it was not a matter of playing a part in a solid and well-established system, but of contributing to the creation and continuation of new structures, it had to be sufficiently long—some members of the working party considered it to be four or five years.

The problem thus consisted in arranging ways in which teachers might be absent for relatively long periods without harming their careers. A number of promising solutions had been found in some countries and universities.

From the formal point of view these solutions were simplest in the case of State universities, where the academic staff were civil servants enjoying all the benefits of this status. This was the case in France, for example, where periods of work abroad raised few problems, particularly in relation to a group of French-speaking countries which had entered into formal agreements with France by which the French universities undertook to fill certain vacant posts in the higher educational institutions of the other country. These secondment procedures varied according to whether or not the teachers concerned held established posts in France. When an established teacher was going to a foreign post, his appointment in his own university was maintained and the Ministry of Education supplied the necessary credits for a substitute during his absence. In the case of young teachers, not yet holding formal appointments but who had passed the competitive examinations for the university career *(agrégation)*, the president of the jury conducting their examination could offer them appointments to posts in French-speaking countries and, if they accepted, posts in French universities were then reserved for them, and they could take them up three or four years later. The same process was carried out in the United Arab Republic where universities were also State institutions, and where professors who accepted foreign posts, usually for periods of four years, kept their home appointments until their return.

Special career arrangements had also been made in countries where university appointments were not linked to the State. Dr. Sloman had mentioned in his report the "home base" system used in the United Kingdom, as well as a number of other arrangements as part of direct agreements between universities. In the United States a number of solutions had been found despite the short-comings, at the Federal level, of the International Education Act. Solutions of this kind were frequently found by organizations like Education and World Affairs or the Rockefeller Foundation which, with others, provided funds enabling some American universities (and Canadian and English ones also) to create extra posts in the social sciences. Dr. Thompson felt, however, that it was doubtful if programmes entirely supported by external agencies, and intended to create a kind of co-operation force, would attract the best candidates. It seemed preferable, even if efforts were supported from outside, that they should be incorporated within university systems themselves. A number of formulae for this could be considered. A faculty of agriculture, for example, could have an "international" department whose members would spend three or four years abroad, thus working for international co-operation and, on their return, enriching their own university with the experience they had acquired. Another faculty might appoint a number of young teachers whose services it would not itself need for a number of years and who could thus carry out a prolonged mission abroad. Generally speaking, Dr. Thompson suggested, many young university people were keenly interested in the chance of working abroad (particularly in the developing countries) and were more and more aware of the advantages on professional, cultural and human grounds which this offered. Universities themselves, however, seemed to have rather conflicting attitudes. Some of the most important were open-minded in this question, and ready to admit the value some of their staff-members might draw from direct experience of foreign countries and different cultures, an experience which at the same time could be of value to the university. But there were less well-established institutions, which took a very different view, since they were anxious to consolidate

their own reputations, and wanted their academic staffs to publish as much as possible and not to be distracted by absences abroad. It had to be remembered also that the legislatures of some American states which the Land Grant colleges has asked for financial aid to cover work abroad by academic staff had turned a deaf ear. The "education" of those concerned seemed necessary.

It should be borne in mind, moreover, that the advantages to be gained from long periods spent in the developing countries were not the same in all academic disciplines. They were more obvious in medicine, tropical agriculture or anthropology than, for example, in high energy physics, but they could be very important in many fields which were of crucial importance for the developing countries. A clearer recognition of this was evidently necessary in university circles. A period given to co-operation was not a "sacrifice" for the donor, but could, on the contrary, be particularly useful to him. The working party thus expressed the wish that universities should consider periods spent abroad by members of their staffs as an integral part of their careers, and ensure that those who undertook them were in no way penalized.

However, if work in co-operation should not interrupt the careers of those involved, the work itself also had to be continuous. Much of its usefulness would be lost if it was not followed up. Before ending its discussion of this question, the working party recommended that university teachers working in foreign universities should try not only to ensure their own teaching and research while there, but to train those who would succeed them.

c) *Financing of teaching abroad.*

Optimum use of available funds.

This concern with continuity provided a starting point for the working party in its discussion of the financing of teaching abroad. It felt that the resources available for this type of co-operation were inadequate and that their effectiveness was often reduced by excessive dispersion. Considerable sums were spent on short-term arrangements, some of which were 'lightning visits' by professors who had no time to grasp the local university situation in all its complexity (and who, as Dr. Porter pointed out, were sometimes made ill by the prodigality of their welcome) and who departed after the rapid formulation of over-hasty advice or the drawing up of a report which was merely shelved indefinitely.

It was vital that available funds should be used for longer visits which would give positive results and stimulate a real continuity of effort. Dr. Thompson stressed that annual credits were not really a very good base for financing these activities, since they made it impossible to ensure any long-term planning. In the case of many programmes of co-operation it was essential for funds to be provided or guaranteed for long periods of time.

Moreover, as Dr. González urged, it was generally desirable that a university benefiting from a programme of co-operation should itself bear part of the cost. This financial involvement from the beginning offered some hope that the work could be carried on when the programme itself had ended. It could be suggested that a university receiving a foreign teacher should pay his local expenses and part of his remuneration, using funds from one of its own vacant posts, a procedure usually possible in

most universities. The other university concerned (or other organization) should cover travel costs and, when necessary, pay part of his salary so that he could continue to receive remuneration on the same scale as at home. It was also important for universities receiving foreign colleagues to define clearly the facilities they were ready to place at their disposal: offices, laboratories, library services and auxiliary staff. Precise plans should be made for the continuation of activities initiated by a foreign guest, based particularly on the young staff that he would train. In the other direction, it was essential for universities sending young teachers and research workers abroad to guarantee posts for them on their return.

The working party endorsed these various remarks and recommended that funds available for co-operation should so far as possible be employed not in isolated operations but in programmes which offered a certain continuity, and that their financing should be arranged in ways that encouraged long-term planning.

It also recognized that, in questions of finance, it was often necessary to look for ways which avoided the use of foreign currencies, a matter on which Dr. Gorshkov insisted. He gave an example of such a method, similar to the earlier proposal of Dr. González—that the "sending" university should be responsible for travel costs, which it could meet in its own currency, and that the "receiving" university should be responsible for local expenses which could be paid in the relevant national currency. With some of the difficulties of foreign exchange avoided in this way, and particularly if the exchanges were on a reciprocal basis, it was relatively easy for two universities to accept comparable expenditures.

Scale of funds.

The working party did not hold a long discussion on the question of the scale of funds available for co-operation. These were considered to be inadequate, and it could only recommend their increase by all possible methods.

International financing.

More time was spent, however, on the question of international financing of co-operation. Bilateral governmental assistance, and even the help provided by some private organizations, as Dr. Moursi stressed, ran the risk of involving political conditions or at least of choices made in terms of political criteria, whether these were admitted or not. Help which was administered through an international fund provided the greatest guarantee of objectivity, and the work done in this field by Unesco, or using Unesco as an intermediary, for example, was of the greatest value. A difficulty was that international funds came from national sources—the same sources which provided bilateral programmes and which they were most reluctant to abandon. A further difficulty was that the administration of co-operative help through an international organization would involve large and expensive agencies and these could hardly avoid a certain bureaucratic clumsiness.

Though it could not, under present conditions, advocate complete international financing of co-operation, the working party expressed the hope that additional funds which could be obtained for it should as far as possible be administered by an international agency, which could exercise the greatest care to ensure that coherence and continuity which the working party considered to be essential for all aspects of assistance.

d) *Obstacles arising from travel restrictions.*

Examination of problems raised by co-operation in the matter of staff showed at once that it was necessary to study the obstacles to it: the shortage of teachers was an obvious one, probably the most important; the lack of financial resources was another. But beyond these obstacles rooted in present conditions and partly responsible for the present crisis, there were others of a more permanent nature. They were less the product of an internal educational situation than of general political and cultural conditions.

Linguistic obstacles.

Linguistic obstacles were among those. These were, of course, to some extent an "internal" aspect of university co-operation, since the practice of such co-operation tended to reduce them, and communication between cultures based on different languages was one of the purposes of co-operation. The multiplicity of languages—whether this was regarded as the curse of Babel or as a happy flowering of diversity—was something affecting not only universities but mankind as a whole, and would do so for a long time to come. It was only too obvious, however, that it handicapped exchanges of teachers. There was only one way of overcoming it in the long run—the raising of the linguistic standards of students and teachers, especially in the main international languages.

In the meantime, to face up to urgent needs, some members of the working party, particularly Dr. Porter, suggested that there should be no hesitation in using the techniques of simultaneous interpretation or ordinary consecutive interpretation where necessary. This solution was obviously useful in a number of cases, particularly where the language used by a visiting professor and the content of his subject were sufficiently known for translation to be effective. Such a system, however, could only be systematically employed by a university which already had people able to operate it, and that was in many cases to beg the question. Professional interpreters, highly enough qualified to be able to translate lectures at university level were still rare, rarer in fact than teachers themselves and certainly not less "expensive".

The problem was less difficult in the case of the exact and natural sciences than in the humanities. The former employ a language which is largely international and deal in concepts and terms which can be exactly translated from one language to another. Yet, as Dr. Parikh stressed, it was in these latter fields that exchanges and, above all, the diversification of exchanges were most desirable. For natural sciences and technology one could, if necessary, be content with the kind of exchanges that arose from traditional linguistic affinities (such as those between India and the United Kingdom). In the humanities, on the other hand, a far wider range was called for and even a university which was well equipped in all fields of study needed to seek the co-operation of university teachers from other cultures. This was all the more true because of the real difficulties mentioned by Dr. Sirinelli, who stressed that "linguistic" obstacles are not limited to language in the narrow sense of the word, but involve a number of intellectual processes and systems of cultural reference more or less explicit, as well as methods of presentation which are of the greatest importance in communication and which are distinct from the language itself, even though they impregnate it. Against such difficulties of comprehension

there seemed to be no other remedy than actual exchanges themselves, for which the knowledge of foreign languages was a necessity.

For these reasons the working party expressed the wish that universities should be more systematically concerned with extending and deepening the linguistic formation of their students and, above all, their young teachers and research workers who would later undertake activities in the field of international co-operation.

Dr. Gorshkov gave an interesting illustration of this. Foreign students arriving in the Soviet Union with no knowledge of Russian were able to achieve a sufficient knowledge of that language in the course of one year of intensive study to be able to follow normal university teaching.

Dr. Parikh pointed out, however, that one could only learn a foreign language well if one had a strong inner motive for doing so. Courses in foreign languages as such were inadequate if they took place in an atmosphere of indifference. Their real value could only be achieved if universities tried to animate students with the interest, curiosity and real desire to know a foreign tongue.

Legal and administrative obstacles.

Legal and administrative arrangements in a number of countries constituted more obvious external obstacles to co-operation.

In the first place, restrictive regulations adopted by governments in the granting of entry and exit visas were often a source of difficulty in exchanges of university teachers and students. In these circumstances, the working party considered whether the establishment of a kind of Laissez-Passer similar to that which the United Nations issued to some of its collaborators and experts could be envisaged for certain categories of teachers and students. For students, such a proposal was quickly seen to be utopian in present circumstances, and even for teachers it seemed unlikely that such a step could be quickly achieved in the present climate of distrust existing between certain governments, together with the suspicion some of them showed towards intellectuals.

Thus the first task seemed to be the changing of this climate and obviously this would need a great deal of time. A change for the better had appeared in recent years, but the extent of what remained to be done was obvious if the present situation was compared with that found in fairly recent periods of history. In the eighteenth century, for example, during the wars between England and France, eminent literary and scientific figures were able to travel freely from one country to the other. More remarkable still, British warships in the Pacific were under orders to give support and assistance to French vessels engaged on scientific voyages there. Circumstances were very different in our age, but it would seem possible for universities, both individually and collectively, to try to press governments to adopt more liberal policies regarding the issuing of visas to university staff.

The working party hoped that the Secretariat of the IAU would keep in touch with Unesco in any measures that could be envisaged for the granting to university teachers (and possibly to students) of an international document which, though it could hardly be a "university passport", might assist in their applications for visas. As Dr. Porter remarked, however, it was not advisable to seek to multiply privileges—i.e., prerogatives beyond those of other citizens—for members of one group or section of society simply because they belonged to it, rather than to assist them in

accomplishing a specific task. Obviously university people had specific tasks to perform, but any facilities accorded to them could only be justified because they furthered those tasks.

Another obstacle of a legal and administrative nature affecting the movement of teachers was that of double taxation, which meant that in some cases they were required to pay taxes both in their countries of origin and in those they visited. A number of measures had already been taken among certain governments for the elimination of double taxation. The working party felt that it would need to dispose of more detailed information on these arrangements before it could offer any suggestions by which they might be extended and systematized.

Import duties and other customs charges affecting the movement of teaching and research materials constituted another obstacle to co-operation. Here again, a number of measures were already in force, such as the Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific and Cultural Character, together with others negotiated under Unesco's auspices. It seemed, however, that this convention was not always respected, even by governments which had ratified it. Not enough efforts had been made to ensure that junior customs officials were fully informed. Here again, the working party believed that the first action to be taken consisted of a critical examination of the arrangements already in force, so that an informed opinion could be reached both on methods of making these arrangements as effective as possible and of identifying further measures which might appear necessary or desirable.

Lastly, the working party dealt briefly with the question of travel costs, particularly by air, which were high enough to constitute a serious obstacle to the movement of university people. In this matter students appeared to be in a better position than teachers since most airlines accorded them special facilities. This situation was not in itself unfair, as the financial resources of students and their organizations were generally even more limited than those of teachers and universities. It remained true, however, that there was a need for systematic examination of what could be done to help university teachers.

On all these points the working party suggested that the next General Conference of the Association (as completely informed as possible on the situation) would doubtless offer the best opportunity of considering common action which could be undertaken or recommended by universities collectively.

At the same time, being fully aware that the liberalization of administrative practices and rules largely depended on the climate and mental attitudes of any given country, the working party underlined the responsibility incumbent on each university to assist in improving these attitudes and recommended that they should see what could be done at a national level by governmental negotiations.

ii) *Student exchanges.*

In the course of its survey of problems of a general kind affecting all categories of people engaged in co-operation, the working party had frequently referred to students. Its discussions under this heading could therefore be limited to questions directly concerning them.

That study abroad was in general an enriching experience was a truism that no member of the working party wished to contradict. At a time of life when people were still receptive, study abroad not only widened the cultural and human experience of the principal beneficiaries, but was important for their fellow-students and the university teachers in the countries where they worked. In the long run, and perhaps more effectively than many other kinds of co-operation, study abroad contributed greatly to international understanding and peace.

Such studies would not raise problems but for the fact that they were expensive in terms of money and so often of time, and obliged to take place in a world so marked by socio-economic disparities. For these reasons, however, they were a rare privilege and it was important to allocate them as well as possible among beneficiaries who could draw maximum advantage from them, both for themselves and for the societies to which they belonged.

These problems occurred with very different degrees of acuteness depending on the country and its level of economic development.

a) *Student exchanges between developed countries*

Obstacles were not particularly serious in the case of exchanges of students among the developed countries. Because of the heterogeneity of university programmes and systems, periods of study spent abroad could be difficult to integrate with normal studies without loss of time and perhaps some initial confusion. It could be held that, in many cases, loss of time of this kind was largely compensated by the intellectual and cultural benefits which were obtained in the course of study abroad. Difficulties of adaptation were probably less important in the case of advanced studies and research work, but the working party did not feel that it could recommend the limitation of exchanges to this level, since many young students certainly benefited greatly from it.

b) *Exchanges between countries of different economic levels and regional exchanges*

A very large part of student movement was from developing countries to developed ones, and it was here that difficulties were most serious. There was a real risk that developing countries would use their tragically limited resources in sending students to developed countries who would then, seduced by the better working conditions that they found, decide to remain permanently, in this way increasing still further the gap between the two types of country. Given this danger—not at all a theoretical one—a policy had taken shape in recent years which could be summarized as follows: students should prepare their first degree in their own countries, and only go abroad for more advanced work.

Experience seemed to show that it was the younger students, still immature, who yielded most easily to the attractions of the "developed" world, and who encountered the greatest difficulty in readapting themselves to their own countries whose problems had not been of much concern to them in their earlier years. Advanced students, on the other land, gave evidence of a greater feeling of responsibility towards their own countries, since the necessary awareness of social and other problems had been formed in them before they left home.

Though it did not dispute the general validity of the formula mentioned above, the working party believed that it was over-simplified and needed closer examination.

In the first place, caution was necessary in using expressions like "advanced studies" or "postgraduate studies". They could be used in reference to systems of very different levels; in some they bore little relation to any clear structural articulation of programmes of study, and were quite vague. So long as this lack of clarity was recognized, however, they had enough indicative value to be useful in a general discussion. An important reason why this division "undergraduate—postgraduate" could not be too rigidly used was that certain types of teaching were completely lacking in the universities of a considerable number of countries, and that in some cases their character was too marginal or too specialized for them to be organized economically in those countries in the immediate future. Though the numbers involved were not large, it was essential to send undergraduate students abroad in such cases, so that they might receive teaching of this kind, so often necessary for their own countries. A second reason, perhaps the most important of all, was that the systematic sending of postgraduate students abroad would deprive the universities of the developing countries of the possibility of forming their own departments for advanced study and research, thus condemning them to a degree of permanent backwardness.

The working party therefore believed that it was the precise needs of the country and university in question which should be the determining factors in the choice of students to be sent abroad.

The term 'abroad', however, was a very wide one, and in order to avoid the difficulties which arose from this at different levels of development, the working party, adopting a suggestion made in Dr. Frondizi's report, strongly recommended that universities should try to arrange their co-operation and exchanges at a regional level. Since all the universities of a region—and particularly a developing region—could not cover all disciplines, it would be useful for a degree of specialization to be established among them, each one concentrating its efforts on the disciplines and level of advanced study and research in which it was already best equipped. With the help of other universities of the region, both in staff and resources, some of them could thus reach the highest rank in a given discipline and act as magnets for the most gifted among the research workers and advanced students of the other countries concerned. The Cardiological Institute of the University of Mexico was cited as an example of what could be done in this way. The working party felt, however, that it would be wrong to hold to a single formula of this kind too dogmatically. Particularly at the level of fully-trained young research workers, it was necessary for contacts to be maintained beyond the frontiers of regions, and lastly, it was stressed that the dangers of periods of study abroad would be greatly reduced if universities tried to guarantee posts to returning students.

Where necessary regional co-operation at the level of advanced studies could also be extended to undergraduate studies, particularly in certain disciplines affecting only a small number of students.

Here the working party again believed that it was better in many cases to help universities to organize their own teaching, rather than to make up for gaps in their own programmes by means of awards for study abroad. It noted, moreover, that the awarding of grants could raise delicate problems in some cases, particularly when they were administered by selection

committees or other services which were not necessarily very familiar with the educational systems from which candidates came. Far from being the best students, these were sometimes those who had failed to obtain a university place in their own countries, and were seeking to make up for this by securing admission to a foreign university. This was often a real difficulty and it was hard to see any general remedy for it. It could simply be emphasized to those responsible for the award of study grants or more generally for the admission of foreign students. The working party finally mentioned the importance of the exchanges and programmes organized by students themselves in different countries, usually for short periods. The value of these activities largely lay in the fact that they were not controlled by the university authorities and therefore kept a high degree of spontaneity, and the working party for these reasons felt that it could not formulate any recommendations concerning them, but believed that they deserved to be encouraged, though not in a paternalistic way.

c) *The "Equivalence" problem*

The problem of study abroad raised the issue of the recognition of these periods of study and of foreign qualifications—the problem usually referred to as that of equivalences.

A university degree had sometimes been viewed as a kind of currency—a way in which knowledge could be "calculated". This "unit of value" in knowledge could be transformed (some would say degraded) into a unit of exchange, but one which was not recognized everywhere, a currency which was quoted only within limited frontiers and which was not freely convertible. Students who had carried out lengthy studies abroad thus ran the risk of seeing part of the results of their work unrecognized, and this was obviously not a minor problem if it was borne in mind, as Mr. Trapero pointed out, that the number of persons undertaking studies abroad had risen from about 156,000 in 1955 to more than 360,000 in 1966.

A distinction had to be made between the civil effect of university qualifications—that is to say, the rights they conferred with regard to the exercise of a profession, and their academic effect—that is to say, the value which was given to them with regard to access to a higher level of study. In practice, the one influenced the other and the Secretariat of the IAU, for example, received many requests for information from government departments wishing to evaluate a university qualification so that its holder might be placed in a relevant professional hierarchy. The two aspects were distinct, however, and an organization like the IAU obviously could only be concerned with the academic one, though this raised problems enough. Moreover, because of this complexity, Unesco had also decided to concentrate its present efforts on the academic aspect of degrees and diplomas.

Some of these complexities were more or less subjective in nature. How could it be expected that personal pride would not be involved in this question of university degrees, for their very possession fostered pride in those holding them? Moreover, if the notion of a "currency" were taken further, people were suspicious of "coins" unfamiliar to them. This led to genuinely objective difficulties, arising essentially from the diversity of university systems. Most of the efforts made on the national, bi-lateral or international level to solve this problem had failed because of this diversity, and because of the difficulty of establishing valid comparisons.

The partial and disappointing results achieved so far were due to them. For example, many of the attempts at solutions which were recorded in the *Collection of Agreements* published by the IAU had never been followed up. For these reasons the working party approved the decision taken by Unesco to carry out a systematic examination of this problem, and to prepare for measures which could eventually be taken in the form of conventions following a series of studies and meetings as outlined in the discussions by Mr. Trapero. As a sequel to the study carried out in 1965-66 by the IAU on "Methods of Establishing the Equivalence of Degrees and Diplomas for Academic Purposes", Unesco had decided to prepare a glossary, which would be issued in French, and would try to define some 1,500 university terms used in 60 countries as well as a pilot project on the comparability of mathematical studies. In addition, Unesco was developing a documentation centre which relied frequently on the IAU when consulted about individual cases, but which was also intended to aid governments in the organization of equivalence services and in the negotiation of agreements. Seminars bringing together specialists from equivalence centres in various countries were also foreseen, and finally, in order to help it in planning a general policy and strategy in this question, Unesco was holding a meeting of experts in Moscow June 1968, at which the IAU was invited to be represented.

The working party noted with interest Unesco's plans in the equivalence field and in view of these, with which it hoped that the IAU and universities would be closely associated, decided not to recommend other initiatives at the international level. It believed nonetheless that universities should themselves continue to examine this problem, and expressed the hope that the IAU Secretariat could maintain the consultative services which it afforded in this field.

It must be recorded, however, that Dr. Gorshkov wondered whether the problem was not being made unnecessarily complicated, and whether it would not be possible to reach rapid agreement among universities on the basis of relatively simple criteria, such as the number of years of study required for a particular degree or diploma.

iii) *Co-operation with regard to study programmes and textbooks*

a) *Study programmes*

It had frequently been maintained, particularly by Dr. Sergeev in the Development Committee of the IAU Board, that the universality of certain natural sciences, like physics and chemistry, ought to make it possible to draw up common study programmes, and that this could be done by specially qualified scientists from different countries.

The advantages of common programmes were immediately obvious — they would solve the problem of equivalences by practically eliminating it, and they would make it much easier to pass from one university to another. Moreover, since they would involve co-operation between specialists from different countries, they would incorporate very wide experience and offer guarantees as to their quality. These arguments, however, did not convince some members of the working party. In the first place, it seemed an illusion to imagine that universities with long experience of autonomy would follow programmes which had been drawn up outside their own walls

by an "oligarchy" of experts, even if, as Dr. Parikh suggested, they were merely put forward as suggestions.

Furthermore, despite the evident importance of the equivalence problem, it could be questioned whether its solution should dominate all university teaching. Would it be worthwhile to sacrifice to it all the invention, initiative and experiment which a university could show in the organization of its own teaching which, together with the fact that these things stimulated the internal life of an institution, could also be very useful at a time when the rapid evolution of knowledge required constant adaptation in study programmes?

Lastly, as Dr. Myers observed, a study programme on paper did not mean very much: everything depended on the teacher, the taught, the methods employed and the resources available. The homogeneity introduced by common programmes would perhaps be a fallacy and the source of misunderstanding rather than clarity.

Did this mean that any form of international co-operation was to be avoided in study programmes? The working party did not take this view. Obviously universities could derive benefit from exchanging their experience and, as Dr. Myers and Dr. Porter stressed, the international exchange of teachers is one of the best ways of ensuring this mutual fertilization, particularly when foreign teachers were asked to take a direct part in the drawing up of programmes.

Moreover, even if programmes were not worked out in common, universities certainly needed to know what was being done in other places and to borrow and adapt for themselves everything they found useful. Thus the exchange of information about programmes was certainly useful.

Lastly, if it was not unanimous concerning the value of common programmes, the working party was able to reach agreement on these latter points and recommended that universities wishing to improve their study programmes should use the experience of universities in other countries as widely as possible through the exchange of documentation, and above all by making the fullest possible systematic use of the help of foreign teachers.

b) *Textbooks*

Linked with the question of common programmes was that of the editing of common textbooks by international teams. If common programmes were adopted, common textbooks would be a logical consequence and the same arguments could be used in favour of both of them. However, the two questions were not at all identical, since the same textbooks could be used in different study programmes, their primary purpose being to set forth certain basic areas of knowledge. It could not be denied that textbooks written jointly by excellent teachers from different university horizons would offer particularly useful and interesting syntheses, and there was certainly no reason to discourage initiatives of this kind.

The main question was to know whether they should be encouraged as a priority, and the working party seemed unconvinced about this. The most urgent problem was not so much that of editing new textbooks as that of making those already in existence—and which were often excellent—more widely available, particularly in the universities of developing countries. The urgent task in which international co-operation could be useful was that of a wide distribution of up-to-date textbooks at reasonable prices for the poorer universities and, in some cases, their translation.

A distinction should be made, moreover, between the editing of common textbooks and the attempts made to harmonize the outlook and to correct errors of perspective due to national prejudices in various social disciplines and the humanities. Various consultations which had taken place in Europe concerning history textbooks and the elimination of over-nationalistic interpretations were a useful example of this. It was clear that initiatives of this kind, serving both truth and peace, deserved encouragement and the working party approved of them unreservedly.

Lastly, textbooks were obviously not the only books of importance in university teaching. Certain scientific and learned publications, by their very nature, could only be produced by international teams of scientists and scholars. This was the case with the *History of Mankind—Scientific and Cultural Development*, undertaken with the help of Unesco, and equally with the *History of Africa*, also due to the initiative of that Organization. These were two somewhat spectacular examples, but co-operation between university colleagues of different countries on more limited projects had also been most successful, and the working party unanimously agreed that initiatives of this kind should be supported and extended.

B. *Research*

Co-operation with regard to publications of the kind which the working party had just been considering affected research as much as teaching, and these two activities were so intermingled that many of the points examined by the working party with regard to co-operation in teaching were equally relevant to co-operation in research, and the conclusions reached could be applied to both of them, particularly with regard to exchange and travel restrictions.

i) *The place of research in programmes of co-operation*

The unity of teaching and research was the first principle which the working party wished to reaffirm in dealing with this point of its agenda. There seemed to be a tendency in some countries to move research away from the universities on the pretext that their teaching work was urgent and should be given priority. It was not possible, of course, to forbid universities to carry out research, but the method used was that of withholding the necessary financial resources and a vicious circle thus arose, for the more research was neglected in universities the easier it was to find excuses for excluding it altogether.

The working party felt that it should be continually repeated that teaching not kept alive by research would decline in quality, and that research was stimulated by teaching. This, of course, did not imply that universities should monopolize all research, and still less that they should consider their teaching responsibilities as secondary or subordinate (as some perhaps tended to do), but it did mean that there would be the greatest danger if universities allowed themselves to be deprived of real research facilities.

The working party insisted that what was valid for university work in general was also valid for that part of it devoted to co-operation, and this should not be considered in any way a separate category, except in the methods required for it. In other words, it was vital for co-operation programmes to be integrated into those of research as well as teaching, for

without this they would lose their drive and their true university character. In particular, it was desirable that teachers working in foreign universities should not confine themselves to giving lectures and courses, but should also play a leading part in research activities.

Difficulties arose in the application of this principle, however, both in detail and in general terms.

Among the detailed difficulties, Dr. Gonzalez mentioned one which arose particularly in the political and social sciences. In countries where "imperialism" or "neo-colonialism" were sensitive subjects, public opinion, and above all student opinion, were most reluctant to see research on matters closely affecting explosive political or social conditions carried out by foreigners, particularly if they came from countries suspected of wanting to exercise pressure in their internal affairs. In these cases certain precautions were necessary, the most important being that foreign research workers should form part of competent local research groups. The project in any case should be clearly under the auspices of a university itself, and not be the responsibility of an individual.

Dr. Porter stressed the wider danger of "neo-colonialism" in research matters. It sometimes happened that foreign scholars and scientists limited their work abroad to research which interested them personally (or their own universities), and gave little attention to local needs and priorities. They were sometimes interested in foreign situations simply because these offered particularly clear "laboratory" examples of problems they were concerned with. When they left they took with them the whole of their documentation, tape-recordings, perforated cards and other research materials. The university which had welcomed them sometimes received nothing more in return than complimentary copies of a book based on the research done. All the raw material, so to speak, was used to enrich the "sending" university and the whole procedure was dangerously close to exploitation.

The working party therefore emphasized that it was not enough for foreign visitors to "do research". Their research should be integrated in a co-operative plan. It should arise from and belong to such a plan. Arising from a plan meant that research projects should be covered by a clear understanding between all concerned and should include participation by a local research team. Belonging to a plan meant that its results should be of genuine benefit to the host university which should be able, where appropriate, to carry on work of its own in the same field and with the aid of research teams trained by visiting colleagues.

The host university should also be able to put the necessary material and equipment at the disposal of its visitors. This touched on a material difficulty connected with the financing of co-operation, a subject already examined by the working party. One obvious means of securing this was the greatest possible increase of funds for co-operative work, and the working party stressed this once more in this connection. It returned also to another of its earlier recommendations concerned with regional co-operation among universities. If certain universities of a region, by agreement with each other and in terms of their various resources and capacities, developed special competence in particular fields of knowledge, regional research centres could be increased and more adequately equipped. Established in this way, such regional centres would be in a better position to apply for help coming from outside the region itself, on the principle that one only lends to the rich. Finally, they would be able to carry out

co-ordinated research programmes of value to several countries. Examples of this kind of regional co-operation were already in existence and the working party recommended their systematic extension.

ii) *Co-operation with regard to scientific and scholarly information*

Regional research centres could form a basis for regional centres of scientific and scholarly information. An important aspect of co-operation in research was in fact not concerned with research workers as such, but with the scientific and scholarly information communicated in the traditional and still predominant way through publications. There was something of a plethora of these. The output of publications, and particularly periodicals, was a serious problem for universities in developing countries, which lacked the necessary foreign exchange for buying them and were unable, because of the comparative penury of publications of their own, to operate exchange agreements on a large scale. Unesco coupons were one way of acquiring cultural and scientific publications without foreign currency, but these coupons were chiefly designed for individuals for whose benefit governments had agreed to waive their normal currency regulations. They were not suitable for the more massive purchases which universities needed to make. Even though a number of well-established universities were generous in their gifts and loans to less favoured institutions, even if the organizations financing co-operation increased their aid, as the working party hoped they would, it seemed unlikely that all needs could be satisfied except by the systematic organization of information exchanges through competent regional centres.

Centres of this kind could not only facilitate the flow of publications, but could also be gradually equipped with the electronic and computerized machines which allowed information to be both stored and quickly available in ways which have no precedent in the past. Experiments of this sort had already been carried out in Europe, notably at the CERN in Geneva. As Dr. Janković pointed out, there was also an information centre for international law in Geneva which used a computer that was of the highest value. Information techniques of this kind gave every promise of solving a large number of problems of documentation, and the working party recommended the urgent creation of centres which could be rationally used in this way.

C. *University Administration and Organization*

i) *Administrative Structures*

As universities were starting to play a more and more decisive rôle in social life, they were requiring larger resources in men and money. They were complex enterprises, often established in countries which had few resources to give them but at the same time looked to them for ever-growing services. In some countries it could be said that bread was almost literally taken from the mouths of the people to feed this *Alma Mater*, and it was not surprising that their performance was watched most critically. This implied that efficient university administration was now a vital matter in the already developed as much as in developing countries. In university matters, however, it was extraordinarily difficult to define efficiency, and

perhaps still more difficult to be "efficient". In the traditional universities, the fact had to be faced that little attention had been given to such a notion. Their administration was entrusted to distinguished scholars and scientists, or to committees of them, and from outside these could give impressions of amateurism and lack of rigour in their managerial processes. Many universities in developing countries had inherited these structures, though their need for tight administration was particularly strong. The principles of economic productivity, however, could hardly be applied to education and research, even though it was true that some of the financial and accounting procedures used in commercial firms, for example, could help to rationalize those used by universities. Dr. Porter felt that too much efficiency had a dehumanizing tendency and it was a necessary part of intellectuai life to keep renewing and changing the structures within which it was maintained. Intellectual life might be harmed if it was constrained within bureaucratic procedures worked out by professional administrators, however rationally conceived. Students, in any case, seemed determined not to be reduced to the status of "perforated cards" in the name of efficiency.

The problem here was obviously an enormous one. It also seemed clear that international co-operation concerning it had been far more sporadic and fragmentary than in matters of teaching and research. This was perhaps because university administrative structures and methods were sometimes closely linked to general national and institutional structures, and to the particular mental habits which were both the origin and the consequence of these. The IAU, it was noted, had begun some comparative work on this in its first study on the administration of universities, and although this was only a first step, the working party hoped that it would be continued.

Unesco was also active in sending expert teams to help in the organization or reorganization of a number of universities. These teams were composed of university people from different traditions, and could thus help in working out new and original methods. The working party hoped that this work could be continued and expanded both by Unesco and by other bodies engaged in co-operative activities.

ii) *Special administrative areas*

The problem of university administration was not simply that of establishing and operating institutional structures, but involved a number of highly specialized activities where the multiplication of exchanges would be useful. The working party listed some which seemed particularly important to it:

a) Methods of financial administration and accountancy.

b) Libraries. The management and organization of libraries had recently been enormously improved in a number of countries and it was important for this progress to be generalized: meetings and exchanges of librarians were therefore necessary.

c) Social services for students, particularly health services, including mental health. Neuroses and sometimes psychoses seemed specially frequent among students. A number of international meetings and discussion groups had already been organized in these matters, but many

universities in the developing countries were not closely connected with them and it was important to help them to take part.

d) Linked with the preceding problem, but nonetheless distinct from it, was that of student guidance and counselling services. A number of international meetings on these subjects had been held but they seemed still too limited in scope.

e) University architecture and campus planning.

For all these matters the working party recommended the increase of exchanges and meetings of specialist teams. It was aware that its list of problems had left out the most urgent problem of all with regard to modern universities—that of participation by students in university affairs and government. This was considered to be so important a question that the working party felt that it should be studied separately, and not as part of a rapid survey of the various fields of international co-operation in administrative matters.

The working party noted with interest that Unesco was intending to call a meeting on this problem. It stressed the need for such discussions, both internationally and regionally (as the Conference of Rectors and Vice-Chancellors of the European Universities proposed to do at its Assembly in Bologna in 1969), but did not formulate precise suggestions on this subject.

Patterns of International University Co-operation

A. *Basic principles governing agreements*

The various patterns of international university co-operation, together with the various kinds of agreements negotiated and the ways in which they were put into effect, were quite fully described in the reports prepared by members of the Administrative Board. The working party did not undertake their detailed examination or offer opinions on the virtues and vices of the various types. It tried instead to establish criteria that were desirable for all of them, and to show by one or two examples how these criteria could be adapted to different forms of co-operation.

Universities, in any case, could hardly have a free choice among all the possible patterns. Their choice was determined by their own charter or constitution, by their relationship with governments and the societies around them, and by the institutional habits of those societies generally. In a number of countries, for example, the government usually intervened in all questions of foreign affairs, the foreign relations of universities included. In others, even though universities could freely make agreements with universities in other countries, they could not finance them without government aid, so that such agreements sometimes remained mere declarations of good intentions if State aid was not forthcoming. In some cases, moreover, universities were unable to ask directly for governmental help. Given these facts, there could be no question of, for example, advocating overgeneralized regulations or of declaring a preference for purely university agreements as opposed to intergovernmental ones.

The patterns of co-operation were not at all irrelevant, however—they determined its content and spirit. It was important, therefore, to pay the closest attention to these patterns, above all when they invoived two

contracting parties of very unequal power and resources. Even between universities there could be agreements which camouflaged a kind of intellectual exploitation under the guise of assistance.

The working party thus insisted that every pattern of co-operation should be based on authentic mutual consent. With this principle established, it drew a number of conclusions.

B. *Methods for full university participation in agreements*

In the first place, whatever kinds of agreement were in question, it was necessary for universities themselves (or their faculties and departments) to be closely associated with their negotiation, if possible from the very beginning. Only in this way could there be a guarantee that the clauses of the agreement were freely and with full knowledge accepted by those who would carry them out, and who would thus be personally concerned, ensuring the subjective motivation necessary for full success in co-operative enterprises. "Consent" should not be understood as a passive attitude, the mere acceptance of methods established by others, but as active involvement and the will to seek success.

This kind of participation was clearly most difficult to ensure in programmes supported by outside organizations or arising from intergovernmental agreements. But even in these cases solutions could be found and Dr. Sirinelli drew attention to two types of agreement concerned with different fields, but ensuring co-operation between governments and universities.

The first type was that of an agreement made between two governments foreseeing co-operation between universities, but expressed in general terms which simply constituted a framework. Once this framework had been laid down, the universities themselves decided in detail what they were able and willing to do, in this way providing detailed content for the agreement in the form of a protocol generally established for a period of one year. This formula seemed particularly useful where two countries were linked in programmes of general assistance within which university co-operation was inserted as one of its elements. But it was equally suitable in the case of countries where universities were fully developed and established on both sides. The governmental agreement was then limited to an engagement to co-operate and to the placing of specific resources at its disposal.

The second formula consisted of requesting the governments concerned to ratify an agreement made between two universities, and to provide money for its execution. This method was specially helpful when two universities wished to help each other but their countries had no general agreement for mutual assistance.

Dr. Moursi mentioned a third variant, which consisted of asking governments to allocate some of the funds they made available for co-operation to a council of universities or of rectors, which then assumed responsibility for the application of intergovernmental cultural agreements.

The question of mutual consent and real participation by both parties could arise, however, even in relation to agreements negotiated directly between universities, particularly when one of them was wealthier and more powerful than the other. Dr. Thompson and Dr. Porter both emphasized this danger. Co-operative programmes were sometimes "distributed" by

rich universities to poor ones and carried out in such a way that they were of greater advantage to the "donor" institution than to the "recipient". Choosing the persons to be sent, and retaining sole financial control of the programme, the former could thus benefit from the facilities of the latter in order to carry out work of interest to itself and to strengthen its position in the region, while the latter received only the crumbs. Here again cultural colonialism could arise, attempting to pass itself off as generosity.

Such activities could properly be called scandalous and to avoid them, as Dr. Thompson suggested, the presence of a third financing agency could be very useful. Such an agency could act as a mediator and remind the donor university of its obligations, in this way strengthening the position of the recipient.

In this context the working party expressed some hesitation about the free-exchange system recommended in the American document submitted. This could be desirable among universities of roughly equal resources, but free exchange seemed premature in situations still marked by imbalances and distortions. It might make these still worse by contributing to that enrichment of the rich and impoverishment of the poor which could be observed in the present world situation. Though it was an ideal for the future, for the time being it needed to be accompanied by the idea of service and planning. Reviewing systematically the recommendations it had already formulated with regard to other points of the agenda, and recognizing the value of free contributions to collaboration among the university community all over the world, the working party put forward the following desiderata for agreements made between rich and poor universities:

i) that they should be as clear and precise as possible with regard to the undertakings and the arrangements for their application and should mention if possible, as Dr. Janković suggested, the persons responsible for carrying them out;

ii) that they should involve responsibility for both parties in the choice of these persons and in the financial administration of the programmes, whatever the sources of the funds provided for them;

iii) that the programmes should not be foreign initiatives within the receiving university, but that the latter should as far as possible take part in them with its own staff and its own resources, so that later it could follow them up on its own;

iv) that programmes undertaken should be of adequate duration even where a definite date of conclusion was fixed. In some cases they should in fact create the very conditions in which they would no longer need to be continued. With many governmental agreements, annual State budgets were an obstacle to long-term financing, but general agreements could often be made and annual details fixed by special protocols. To these general conclusions Dr. Porter added that in some cases universities in developing countries would prefer to dispense with inter-university agreements and in their place receive supplementary funds directly, which would enable them to take their own initiatives in recruiting research workers and teachers needed for their development.

Finally, the working party stressed that the same principles of mutual consent and authentic participation should, *mutatis mutandis*, apply to programmes carried out under the auspices of international organizations like Unesco, WHO and FAO. Members of the working party who had had

personal contact with some of these programmes valued them highly, and were particularly impressed with the advantages arising from the international composition of the teams and missions sent out. The only reserve formulated was that sometimes the universities involved did not take a close enough part in the choice of their members.

The great agencies of the United Nations were not the only international organizations helping to finance co-operative programmes. Some of them arose from regional initiatives, and the fact was that there were many institutions of great diversity which were helping in the work of co-operation with a multiplicity of programmes in consequence. The working party wondered whether proliferation of this kind did not lead to waste, and if it ought to recommend some rationalization of these efforts. It decided, however, to support the view of Dr. González who felt that in general the more programmes there were the better, so long as they were the result of genuine goodwill on the part of both their promoters and their beneficiaries. Their very multiplicity was a source of useful experiment, and any attempt to group these initiatives too systematically might lead to a kind of central bureaucracy, reducing still further the margin of initiative and negotiation left to universities in developing countries.

The working party recognized, however, as Dr. Sirinelli pointed out, that the multiplication of inter-university links and "jumelage" agreements, when they were not accompanied by adequate financing, inevitably led to a certain dilution of co-operation. In extreme cases such agreements, when there was no money to back them, were merely a kind of gesture of courtesy which universities in different countries made to each other.

One kind of agreement, not often encountered but which seemed to Dr. Parikh to need mention, was that which united a group of universities in several developed countries in helping to set up a university in a developing one. Recognizing that universities had a natural tendency to create others in their own image, the working party agreed that this kind of collaboration could be particularly useful in the setting up of an institution attempting to answer special needs and thus wanting to profit from a variety of models.

C. *University agencies and activities*

The main interest of the working party was concentrated on agreements and arrangements concerned with mutual university programmes, but it did not overlook the fact that other forms of university co-operation existed and in particular membership of international and regional university organizations. Since it was helping to prepare for a General Conference of the IAU, the working party felt that it had no need to stress to such a body —which was itself certainly the best judge—the value of these forms of collaboration.

Nonetheless, it wished to mention some original arrangements for university consultation which were permanent in character though they did not involve individual membership in a particular group. An excellent example of this was the seminar which under the title "The University To-day" was organized every year by the League of Yugoslav Universities. This provided an occasion for the teachers and students invited from various parts of the world to exchange views on important university problems. Dr. Janković gave additional details of these seminars and invited his colleagues of the working party to come to see for themselves how they operated.

Effects and Purposes of International University Co-operation

A general definition of the purposes of international university co-operation was not difficult to agree upon. There was complete agreement that its purpose was on the one hand to help universities in different countries in their essential tasks of teaching, research and development and, on the other, to reinforce international understanding and thus contribute to the maintenance of peace. These purposes in fact were so self-evident that they had been implicit in all the discussions of the working party.

An abstract discussion of them at the opening of the meeting, even though it might have seemed logical to begin in this way, would have been of little interest. On the contrary, it seemed much more rewarding to return to a critical re-examination of the purposes of co-operation, having considered some of its actual effects. Only by a comparison of purposes and results was it possible to re-define them. In any case, this was the method adopted by the working party, which attempted at this stage to evaluate the effects of co-operation.

A. *The effects of co-operation*

i) *General effects*

It was obvious at once that no exact balance sheet of the effects of co-operation could be established. In some cases those effects were strictly speaking imponderable, and the most profound of them were those which affected the minds of individuals. Some sort of measurement or at least evaluation could be attempted, but co-operation was so integral a part of the whole of university activities (though not always widely enough practised) that it could hardly be calculated, so to speak, in a separate account.

Throughout all its discussions, moreover, the working party had been constantly dealing, explicitly or implicity, with the effects of co-operation, since it was on the basis of the experience gained in a particular field or form of co-operation that it had formulated its recommendations. Despite this, it wished to recapitulate them and to examine closely some of the pitfalls to be avoided if co-operation was to yield its best results.

Firstly, on the credit side of the balance sheet, it was beyond dispute that co-operation was not merely beneficial but in the strictest sense necessary. Without it many universities would have been unable to live or develop, others would have sunk into provincialism—all would have been worse off. The number of universities directly involved in systematic co-operative activities was perhaps relatively small, but since communication was a fundamental element of all university life, co-operation produced results of benefit to everyone, an atmosphere felt by all and which extended across the entire world community which universities formed. This was often a slow process, however, and the working party had several times stressed the need for a quantitative increase in co-operation. It was also sometimes affected by distortions, and this meant that there was also need for qualitative improvement.

ii) *Special effects: the "Brain Drain"*

One of these distortions had already been frequently mentioned by the working party. Programmes which were badly conceived or too much

under the influence of the stronger party led to a sort intellectual exploitation and thus to lingering resentment, and this, of course, was the last thing desired both on practical and psychological grounds. In the long run a multiplication of thoughtless or harmful programmes could actually increase the troubles existing between rich and poor countries and present even in intellectual circles.

A second difficulty was more specific. This was the phenomenon known as the drain brain, and the working party gave special attention to it. It agreed first of all that this phenomenon was not inherent in co-operation, neither was it an inseparable consequence of it. Co-operation involved the movement of persons and this in fact was one of its purposes, but it did not imply a kind of one-way traffic and the draining away by some countries of talented individuals from others. Some essential distinctions were needed in discussing these matters.

There was a purely university aspect of this problem affecting university teachers and research workers; there was also an economic aspect affecting technologists, doctors and various professional people.

a) On the purely university level most members of the working party felt that the problem was not excessively grave, at least on the world scale and except in one or two special situations. They believed that any restriction on freedom of movement and residence within the world-wide university community would have far more serious consequences in the long run than the brain drain itself.

With regard first of all to young research workers of really outstanding ability it was inevitable and even desirable that they should seek out the best possible conditions for their work and that they should go abroad and stay abroad if these conditions could not be found at home. Their work was of benefit to the entire learned and scientific world, and their talents would be stultified if they were obliged to remain in countries where they could not be fully used.

With regard to what might be called "run of the mill" teachers and research workers, there were undoubtedly those who settled abroad when they would have been able to do useful work in a university of their own country. But it seemed that this happened comparatively rarely when the sending universities guaranteed posts on their return for people whom it sent abroad, in cases where such study was carried out within the framework of clear and coherent agreements related to genuine needs, and in cases where the stronger university did not seek to use its co-operation programmes as a disguised form of recruiting. In these matters the working party reiterated the recommendations it had already made.

It hoped that all universities would in time be able to offer posts to their younger staff which would both attract them and retain them, but it recognized that this hope partly assumed that the problem had already been resolved. In any case, this objective could only be reached through a general reinforcement of co-operation.

b) The brain drain seemed a much more serious matter in a number of sectors of active professonal life such as technology and medicine, and in some instances the losses were extremely grave. This effect of the phenomenon, however, was caused by economic and social factors—particularly different levels of prosperity—where universities as such had comparatively little influence. As Dr. Jankovic pointed out, the brain drain also occurred not only between different countries but from one region to another

within the same country. Only in cases where universities trained students for careers in which there were inadequate openings within their own country could they be held at least partially responsible for the brain drain. When they did this, of course, they were in effect encouraging a number of their graduates to emigrate, and this raised some delicate problems, particularly in the developing countries. As Dr. Parikh emphasized, projections of manpower needs were often based on unjustified hypotheses. These projections, he believed, were usually inaccurate. In any case universities were not merely professional schools and it was normal that they should be concerned with scientific and other disciplines which were not immediately useful on the labour market. However, in this matter it was one thing to prepare the foundations of the university's own future and quite another to give too important and too premature a place to studies which had no real outlet. This, at least, was the opinion of Dr. Porter and Dr. Sirinelli. The forecasting of manpower needs was certainly precarious and required constant revision, but it could give indications often corroborated by common sense. An extreme example of this was quoted. It could reasonably be asserted that Africa had no priority need of large numbers of Greek or Sanskrit scholars, but it was desirable that it should have some.

The other side of the medal was that universities in the developed countries sometimes educated students coming to them from the developing areas of the world in specializations which could not be used in their own countries. This happened in medicine for instance. The ultra-scientific aspects of medicine, relying on costly equipment and methods in the most advanced countries, were irrelevant in the primitive conditions of many areas of the world. This, however, was a delicate problem, since the institution of special training for students from developing countries, however excellent in itself, could look like "second-class" training if it was carried out in the same institution alongside more "normal" training. Dr. Gorshkov said that this problem was perhaps most easily avoided in an institution like the Peoples' Friendship University in Moscow, which had been specially set up for students from the developing countries.

B. *The purposes co-operation*

How could the double purpose of co-operation—the mutual strengthening of universities in their own tasks and the deepening of international understanding—be clarified at the close of this detailed examination of its areas, patterns and effects?

In the first place, some general formulation embracing both the university and social aspects of co-operation seemed to be called for, and Dr. Parikh proposed the following, which the working party approved: the peaceful development of human abilities and resources is a common responsibility for all universities, and the discharge of this responsibility through common action is the fundamental purpose of co-operation.

If there was a single fundamental purpose of co-operation, however, it had a dialectical nature, or one which gave rise to a dialectical movement. Co-operation aimed at the development of human resources, but did so in its own special way. It sought to bring about conditions in which every university (particularly those in developing countries) could base itself primarily on men and women from its own country. When this stage was

achieved, however, another immediately would take its place, for these men and women could not reach their full cultural, scientific and human development without integration into the world-wide university community, in a full and not merely an abstract sense. There was a "technical assistance" side to university co-operation which would decline in importance in the long run, and a permanent and regular one which would, on the contrary, be intensified in the future. The working party insisted that these were not two entirely different kinds of co-operation, but two stages of a single movement. Even if different methods were needed in these two stages, each of them needed to be animated by the same spirit—the university spirit.

The Place of International University Co-operation in University Life

In the light of the working party's discussion of purposes, the conclusion was obvious that co-operation should not be viewed as a marginal or extraneous university activity, still less as a luxury which could only be afforded when more necessary things had been provided for. Co-operation must occupy a central place in university activities: it was an integral part of a university's functions.

The working party had no difficulty in agreeing about this, but readily recognized that such generalizations required more precise definition.

In the first place, it would be an illusion to imagine that all universities could play an equal part in active co-operation, and the fact was that many of them remained more or less outside the present international exchanges and programmes. Even in these cases, however, they received innumerable outside contributions for their own activities, and could only function effectively by drawing regularly from the common fountain of knowledge and culture. They were involved in co-operation even if they did not realize it, just as Monsieur Jourdain wrote prose. It was important for them to realize this, and become more consciously aware of what they owed to co-operation and thus be prepared to cultivate the international spirit more intensively within their own precincts—what might be termed university internationalism.

It had been argued that universities should seek to be the most international of all institutions within a given country, and if this axiom were generally accepted, many universities would doubtless find it easier to obtain funds for international co-operation from their governments, or at least create a more open attitude towards it. The internationalism of a university should not be measured necessarily by the number of nationalities represented in its academic staff and among its students. Primarily this was an attitude of mind, and a concern for thinking and living in terms of a world where new communications were creating a new unity even while they revealed its diversity. The working party readily agreed that many universities in developing countries should devote their essential resources to national tasks. But it was vital for them to preserve and develop the international spirit, and to make every effort to give their students knowledge of foreign languages and foreign cultures.

Universities in developed countries, the working party felt, and as it had insisted in all its discussions, should encourage more active, more carefully-planned and more deeply-integrated international activities in every sphere of their work.

It agreed also that university co-operation should not be limited to activities within universities only. More and more, universities were co-operating with other educational institutions, with governmental, industrial and cultural bodies and could act as intermediaries in bringing these into contact with similar institutions in other countries (for example, in practical terms, in finding places in industry for foreign visitors or in arranging the re-training of secondary school teachers).

Finally, some members of the working party recalled that the international spirit involved not only co-operation in common tasks, but also the shared determination of universities to resist the oppression, hostility and deliberate misunderstandings which some of them faced in their relations with the governments of their countries. Universities by definition were strongholds of the critical spirit, but some of them felt very isolated in their struggles and might well abandon all resistance to unjustified governmental interference if they were not given moral support. International solidarity in fact seemed greater among students—since they were not so tied to the established order—than it was in any other sector of academic life. This was perhaps a field in which students were setting an example to the institutions which taught them.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES

1, rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

PERIODICAL

* *Bulletin of the International Association of Universities.*
Since 1953. Quarterly: February, May, August, and November.

REFERENCE WORKS

International Handbook of Universities.
Sixth edition, 1974. xi + 1338 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-123-3

World List of Universities, Other Institutions of Higher Education and University Organizations 1973-1974.
Eleventh edition, 1973, xviii + 482 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-021-0
Twelfth edition, 1975, in preparation

Collection of Agreements Concerning the Equivalence of University Qualifications.
1966, vii + 655 pages (reprint).
ISBN 92-9002-013-X
Second volume, 1961-72, in preparation.

Documents Concerning the Equivalence of University Qualifications.
1957. 280 loose leaves (microfilm).

PAPERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES

1. *Three Aspects of University Development Today.* 1953. 46 pages.
2. *Health at the University.* 1954. 76 pages.
3. *Student Mental Health.* 1958. 76 pages.
4. * *University Education and Public Service.* 1959. 151 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-102-0
5. * *The Interplay of Scientific and Cultural Values in Higher Education Today.*
1960. 81 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-103-9
6. * *The Expansion of Higher Education.*
1960. 117 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-104-7
7. *University Autonomy — Its Meaning Today.* 1963. 139 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-110-1
8. *The Administration of Universities.*
1967. xiii + 99 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-114-4
9. *International University Co-operation.*
1969. xvi + 161 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-115-2
10. *The University and the Needs of Contemporary Society.* 1970. xv + 81 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-116-0
11. *Problems of Integrated Higher Education - An International Case Study of the Gesamthochschule.* 1972.
85 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-120-9
12. *The Social Responsibility of the University in Asian Countries—Obligations and Opportunities.*
1973. 124 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-122-5
13. *A Critical Approach to Inter-University Co-operation.*
1974. 138 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-124-1

STUDIES AND REPORTS

The Staffing of Higher Education.
1960. 169 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-106-3

Some Economic Aspects of Educational Development in Europe.
1961. 144 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-108-X

Formal Programmes of International Co-operation between University Institutions.
1960. 39 pages in-4° (published by Unesco).

Report of a Meeting of Heads of African Institutions of Higher Education, Khartoum, 16-19 September 1963.
1964. 107 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-109-8

* *Report of the International Conference of Universities, Nice, December* 1950. 1951. 162 pages.

Report of Proceedings, Second General Conference of the International Association of Universities, Istanbul, September 1955. 1956. 232 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-101-2

Report of Proceedings, Third General Conference of the International Association of Universities, Mexico, September 1960. 1961. 224 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-107-1

Report of the Fourth General Conference of the International Association of Universities, Tokyo, 31 *August-6 September* 1965. 1966. 264 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-112-8

Report of the Fifth General Conference of the International Association of Universities, Montreal, 30 *August-5 September* 197
1971. 291 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-118-7

Administrative Reports of International Association of Universities: 1951-1954. 1955. 40 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-100-4

Idem: 1955-1959. 1960. 58 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-105-5

Idem: 1960-1964. 1965. 129 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-111-X

Idem: 1965-1969. 1970. 117 pages.
ISBN 92-9002-117-9

JOINT UNESCO-IAU RESEARCH PROGRAMME IN HIGHER EDUCATION (1)

The International Study of University Admissions:
Vol. I: *Access to Higher Education,* by Frank Bowles. 1963. 212 pages.
Bound: ISBN 92-3-100574-X
Paper: ISBN 92-3-100575-8
Vol. II: *National Studies.*
1965. 648 pages.
ISBN 92-3-100608-8

Higher Education and Development in South-East Asia:
Summary Report. 1965. 94 pages.
ISBN 92-3-100543-X

Higher Education and Development in South-East Asia:
Vol. I: *Director's Report,* by Howard Hayden. 1967. 508 pages.
ISBN 92-3-100651-7
Vol. II: *Country Profiles.*
1967. 615 pages.
ISBN 92-3-100650-9
Vol. III: Part 1. *High-level manpower for development,* by Guy Hunter.
1967. 184 pages.
ISBN 92-3-100649-5
Part 2. *Language policy and higher education,* by Richard Noss.
1967. 216 pages.
ISBN 92-3-100648-7

Teaching and Learning: An Introduction to New Methods and Resources in Higher Education.
by N. MacKenzie, M. Eraut, H.C. Jones. 1970. 209 pages.
ISBN 92-3-100798-X

* Published with the financial assistance of Unesco.

(1) Reports issued under this Programme are produced jointly by Unesco and IAU and may be purchased through national distributors of Unesco publications.

SOFIAC, 8, rue de Furstenberg, Paris (VI°)
Imp. n° 3720. — 4° trimestre 1974